UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

ADMINISTRATION IN PROFILE FOR SCHOOL EXECUTIVES

EXPLORATION SERIES IN EDUCATION

Under the Advisory Editorship of

John Guy Fowlkes

Administration in Profile for School Executives

HARLAN L. HAGMAN

PROFESSOR OF EDUCATION AND DEAN
OF THE COLLEGE OF EDUCATION, DRAKE UNIVERSITY

and

ALFRED SCHWARTZ

ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR OF EDUCATION
DRAKE UNIVERSITY

HARPER & BROTHERS PUBLISHERS

NEW YORK

ADMINISTRATION IN PROFILE
FOR SCHOOL EXECUTIVES

Copyright, 1955, by Harper & Brothers ©
Printed in the United States of America

*All rights in this book are reserved.
No part of the book may be used or reproduced in any manner whatsoever without written permission except in the case of brief quotations embodied in critical articles and reviews. For information address Harper & Brothers
49 East 33rd Street, New York 16, N.Y.*

C-E

Library of Congress catalog card number: 55-6776

To
Floyd W. Reeves
and
Eugene S. Lawler

CONTENTS

	EDITOR'S INTRODUCTION	ix
	PREFACE	xi
	HOW THIS BOOK MAY BE USED	xiii
I.	SCHOOL ADMINISTRATION AND RELATED FIELDS	1
II.	THE FACTOR OF LEADERSHIP IN ADMINISTRATION	21
III.	THE FACTOR OF PURPOSE IN ADMINISTRATION	54
IV.	THE FACTOR OF ORGANIZATION IN ADMINISTRATION	74
V.	THE FACTOR OF AUTHORITY IN ADMINISTRATION	107
VI.	THE FACTOR OF GROUP INTERACTION IN ADMINISTRATION	129
VII.	THE FUNCTION OF PLANNING IN ADMINISTRATION	160
VIII.	THE FUNCTION OF COMMUNICATION IN ADMINISTRATION	181
IX.	THE FUNCTION OF COORDINATION IN ADMINISTRATION	207
X.	THE FUNCTION OF PROBLEM SOLVING IN ADMINISTRATION	237
XI.	THE FUNCTION OF EVALUATION IN ADMINISTRATION	266
XII.	EMERGING THEORY IN SCHOOL ADMINISTRATION	293
	INDEX OF NAMES	309
	INDEX OF SUBJECTS	312

EDITOR'S INTRODUCTION

Administration may be defined as the exercise of leadership toward a given focus or purpose. School administration may be defined as the exercise of leadership towards the complete and desirable development of human beings. While each specialized field of administration is unique there is a marked similarity or indeed a common strand between and among all "administrations." Focus of purpose is the differentiating or unique quality or factor in the exercise of leadership and hence administration.

Effective administration demands thorough familiarity with a set of basic principles regardless of the particular area of activity. During recent years both theorists and practitioners of administration have devoted increasing attention to the underlying foundations of administration. Laudably, specialists in school administration have been exerting increased effort in acquainting themselves with the whole sweep of public administration in order to guarantee more completely the observance of sound executive tenets.

Interdepartmental seminars conducted jointly by teachers of educational administration and such specialists as professors of political science, public finance, and public administration; co-operative research projects in school administration involving both educationalists and non-educationalists; and many treatises enjoying a joint authorship of school administrators and representatives from cognate fields mark some of the more promising means of arriving at a rubric of administrative doctrine regardless of the focus.

However, those in the field of education who have been most actively concerned with the bulwarking of school administration with related material in the total field of administration have be-

come keenly aware of the need of a systematic combing of the total literature of administration towards the presentation of a set of basic guiding principles. The volume hereby presented is the result of such a combing along with penetrating interpretation and observation.

The authorship of this treatise is a happy one of sound scholarship and practical skill in school administration. It seems inevitable that those who read this work will gain sharper insight and thus improved adeptness in the practice of school administration.

JOHN GUY FOWLKES

January, 1955

PREFACE

The administrator of a modern public school system is in a unique position in the community served by the school system, yet in some ways his position is related to that of administrators in other fields of activity. One may discover common elements in administration even though the nature of each enterprise is unlike that of any other enterprise in the vicinity. Administrators must plan, decide, organize, communicate, coordinate, evaluate, lead, and otherwise function in ways common to administration whether the concern is selling merchandise at retail or providing educational experiences.

The recognition of common elements in all fields of administration leads to the possibility of discovering and formulating principles of *administration* as apart from principles of *administration in business, administration in government, administration in education,* and so on. The search for principles seems a task for the theorist, not for the practical administrator of whatever area of activity, yet the identification of basic principles could serve to increase effectiveness and efficiency of administration of whatever kind. The study of administration in process promises much, provided that the principles which are presumably identified are truly those of administration in general and are not limited to one field of applied administration. In the former case, the findings will be immensely practical since they will provide a frame of reference for all administrators. In the latter case, conditions peculiar to the field of activity may counsel acceptance of what may be demonstrated in the broader view and in the long run as false and harmful.

Factors and functions of educational administration are ex-

amined in the following chapters from the point of view of the school executive and in the light of contributions from other fields of administration or associated social activity. Appropriately a textbook such as this raises many questions and offers few answers while stimulating thought and discussion of fundamental concepts of administration. If this book does that, it will justify itself as an *approach* to the development of administrative theory for school executives.

For their courtesy in permitting quotation of significant passages from many books, acknowledgment is made to *Harvard University Press, McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., Harper & Brothers, The University of Chicago Press, American Council of Education, The Institute of Public Administration, Richard D. Irwin, Inc., Prentice-Hall, Inc., The Woman's Press, The Macmillan Company, Rinehart and Company, Inc.,* and *The Ronald Press Company.* To many persons who assisted in bringing together materials from the several fields of administration, to Margaret Hamilton, Delle Schwartz, and Mary Hagman, our thanks are offered.

HARLAN L. HAGMAN
ALFRED SCHWARTZ

Des Moines, Iowa
December, 1954

HOW THIS BOOK MAY BE USED

Administration in Profile for School Executives has been planned as a textbook for graduate classes in school administration. Earlier experience in general courses in school administration or experience in administrative positions in the public schools will be helpful to the student. The practicing school administrator should find the detailed treatment of administrative processes helpful as problems arise in his day-to-day work.

Although this book is designed to follow a given basic textbook in school administration, it may be used in conjunction with it. When so used, groups of students may be assigned responsibility for connecting discussions of theory with the separate sections of the general textbook used. The enrichment of student reading may be accomplished through the long reference lists offering guidance to representative literature in administrative fields. Panel discussions may be built around the questions which open each chapter.

Advanced students of school administration may prefer seminar discussions growing out of the reading of each chapter and associated books and articles. The questions may be used to open discussion, to assist in the forming of panels or discussion groups, or to arouse interest in the further exploration of each topic treated. Emphasis should be laid upon the student's becoming conversant with the literature in educational administration and in the many fields related to it. Each student should be encouraged to develop his own lists of principles of administration with respect to each factor or function discussed. Research projects in the area of each topic may be created through examination of the questions which open each chapter or may arise from the premises which are im-

plicit in the treatment the book gives each administrative factor or function.

The instructor may prefer to lead the class into discussion of each topic in order, or he may wish to tie in discussion with case studies of school administration. Through either approach, application to practical leadership problems is possible and desirable. If the class includes experienced principals, superintendents of schools, or other administrators, such application will be easy. If there are no experienced administrators in the group, descriptions of typical problem situations may need to be developed by the instructor.

ADMINISTRATION IN PROFILE FOR SCHOOL EXECUTIVES

CHAPTER I

School Administration and Related Fields

Is administration considered properly a science, an art, or a process? Does administration exist apart from the totality of activity which it energizes and directs?

Should administration be studied in terms of specific administrative acts in specific situations rather than in terms of general principles and concepts?

Should the administrator who is successful in one field of administration be expected to be successful in another field?

Is there a basic difference between democratic administration and authoritarian administration or is the difference only one of ends?

Is it unwise to develop concepts of school administration from study of administration of business enterprises, military establishments, and non-school governmental units?

Can the principles of school administration be discovered through an examination of practice?

I

While the tasks assumed by public education have multiplied in number and magnified in social significance in our time, the provisions for their achievement have not been enlarged or improved in like degree. It may be observed that the school organization itself has not been modified basically toward more efficient and effective accomplishment of its reasons for existence. Instead, school organization has been altered by the addition of patch upon patch on a structure designed more for a program of limited education

in a few academic areas than for a program of broad fields of activity in a modern school. The administrator of a modern school system has found his responsibility increased manifold by the addition of duties arising from the new assignments to the schools of adult education, community services of many kinds, health and counselling provisions, special education, lunch programs, pupil transportation, and other academic and non-academic concerns. It occasions no surprise that developments in school organization and administrative procedures have not paralleled the expansion of the role of the public school, for in the social-science areas the reach usually does exceed the grasp and that condition is not necessarily undesirable. The vision of what might be ought not to be determined by the availability of ways and means but the latter might be expected to be discovered or developed in the light of the vision.

The public educator need not be overly troubled about a condition which suggests that the means at hand are not immediately equal to the expanding role which education is expected to play. However, there ought to be evident promise of improvement in both process and structure toward meeting new demands. The school administrator, among educators, is chargeable for that improvement: he must be concerned that the organization with which he works and the administrative processes which are employed are changing and improving as the needs which call them into being change in a dynamic society. He may be expected to be a kind of social engineer developing and adjusting educational processes and structures to keep them serving the purposes for which schools are maintained by society. For this kind of engineering, the administrator must be intelligently sensitive to the social environment in which the schools find themselves presently and in which they may find themselves in the foreseeable future. More than he commonly is prepared, he needs to be a social scientist with broad understanding of men and society. The kind of professional provincialism found among many specialists will serve

the school administrator poorly in the enlarged role given him by the present-day school system.

While both structure and process have been emphasized as requiring study and improvement, it is to the study of process that the administrator might give his attention with confidence that improvement of the processes will bring about the improvement of the administrative structures necessary to carry them.

It is in the study of process rather than of structure that he may find useful the consideration of related fields in both administration and the social sciences. The processes of administration familiar to the administrator of public schools are employed in business, government, industry, and wherever, whenever, and however men organize common effort toward a group objective. The administrator is present to plan or to assist in planning, to organize or to assist in organizing, to lead, to coordinate, to communicate, to evaluate, to serve in all the ways administrators serve in enterprises involving two or more persons in concerted action.

The administrator of public schools may learn from his counterparts in activities far removed in nature from public education. There is a kinship between the tasks of education and the tasks of related fields, though the problems of the former may seem often to be peculiar to it and answerable only in the language of the professional educator. Expertness in sociology, psychology, political science, business and industrial administration, and other fields of human relationships may be drawn upon by public educators to their advantage, provided that they ask such questions as can be answered in ways meaningful to those whose expertness lies within the field of public education. This does not belittle either the questions or the answers, the questioners or the answerers. For the expert can speak effectively in the area of his expertness if that area encompasses the question which is put to him. One should not expect the specialist in military organization to organize effectively a school for elementary school children nor should the successful elementary school principal be expected to organize an army. Each

might find, however, that some common elements are identifiable in two otherwise discrete fields of administration and that within those common elements each is properly held to be expert. Each might offer expert counsel if the questions put with respect to the other's field fell within the experience areas common to both fields.

The objection will be made that public school systems once did borrow heavily from both the military and business and that the resulting educational organizations did not serve well the needs of public education. Where school systems still are rigidly line-and-staff with authoritarian philosophies in control, the adoption of business and military practices in the past was most certainly to the disadvantage of public education conceived as education in the interest of living in a democracy. The objection is well raised if the proposal to borrow from related fields is thought to be advocacy of a slavish imitation of administrative and other processes and practices in fields of human endeavor removed in nature and spirit from that of public education. Creative administration, however, rejects imitation, and the school administrator can profit from the experience of the administrator of a department store or the manager of a factory only in so far as that kind of experience contains elements to be found also in the administration of public schools.

The public educator is aware of the changing tasks of education and the development of school administration in the direction of a more democratic organization, wider participation of group members in administration, and a greater concern for the welfare and happiness of individual members of the group. He may or may not know that these developments are not to be found in educational administration alone. Pressures in the directions indicated arise from without as well as from within the educational organization. The sociologist could tell the public educator much about present-day society and the rise of new interests and new concerns among the peoples of the world. The political scientist could read for him the signs of the times in the changing aspects of government. The

business administrator could tell him of the significance to business of new attitudes of management toward labor and of labor toward management. Persons in many fields might well assist the public educator in understanding better the social currents affecting public education and the administration of schools.

The public school is a great social enterprise. The forces which animate it and shape it are to be found in the society which created it and which sustains it and which will destroy it as a social institution should it not be serving the purposes for which it is intended. The school administrator must have broad social understanding requisite to his assignment. Should he lack this understanding, the schools under his leadership cannot fulfill their role in terms of the functions of modern schools in the democracy of our times.

II

In all administration, the fundamental task is the organizing of the efforts of people. Cooperation does not come about automatically but develops in organization and under leadership which seeks it. This is true in all fields, not just that of school administration. Though one may not agree fully with Elton Mayo's statement that "human capacity for working together has continually diminished," it is clear that Man's ability to work cooperatively has not developed in proportion to his accomplishments in technical matters.

He is an inveterate optimist who is not sobered by a comparison of our own time with the high expectations of a century ago. Bernard Cracroft, writing in 1867, expressed the general attitude of the early years of the nineteenth century. "The mercantile fever," "the ardent faith in progress" were based upon belief in "the boundless development of human energy striving like fire ever upwards." "Unforeseen but probable discoveries" were expected at any moment to "throw additional millions into the lap of human comfort." By such means it was expected that man would raise himself above the possibilities of privation and strife.

This belief expressed certainty of immense future advance in scientific discovery, mechanical invention, the development of economic knowledge, and industrial organization. And this belief has nowhere proved vain: the actual advance in the last century of scientific discovery, mechanical invention, economic knowledge, and organization has surpassed by far anything that Cracroft and his contemporaries could possibly have anticipated. To cross the continent from coast to coast in a few hours of the night by air has become a commonplace. Men talk to each other across three thousand miles of sea without wires or any tangible connection. In no area of activity have nineteenth-century expectations been disappointed: the fulfillment has by far outdone the hope.

But privation and strife have not vanished from the earth. On the contrary, we look out at a world torn by internecine strife that extends more widely and runs deeper than any other instance history can show. The human privation that has followed, and is still to follow, is of similar dimension. All the immense advancement of knowledge has apparently been powerless to prevent a resurgence of the most savage barbarism. Indeed, it often seems as though scientific advancement has served only to implement—to give weapons to—resurgent barbarism.

This leads to a feeling of confusion and pessimism. The word "chaos" creeps into the daily vocabulary. Evidence given before a recent Senate committee showed a tendency to bitter acceptance of chaos as inevitable. But pessimism of this type is too general, too obsessive. It does not pause to ask more precisely where the chaos lies. In the strict sense, it cannot be said to lie in science, or mechanics, or economics, or industrial organization. The work that has been done, and is being done, in these areas, though necessarily limited, is admirable. But, beyond all this, some essential determinant of order in human affairs has been left out of account in two centuries of rapid development.

The writing of economists hint the omission. Sir Arthur Salter, in 1933, in describing the structure of an ordered society, asserted that no such order can be contrived unless backed by "collective determination." Sir George Paish, in a small and recently published essay, *The Defeat of Chaos* (1941), describes, probably admirably, the economic conditions necessary to the achievement of international (and intra-

national) prosperity and peace. At the beginning and end of his essay, he mentions a "spirit of willing cooperation" as necessary to any such happy issue out of our afflictions. But he does not tell us how this exceedingly important change is to be effected. The human fact that emerges from these or any other studies is that, *while material efficiency has been increasing for two hundred years, the human capacity for working together has in the same period continually diminished.* Of late, the pace of this deterioration seems to have accelerated. This observation is strikingly evident in the international field; it is evident also within any modern society, if the relation between the constituent groups be closely inspected. Discussions in the technical reviews, somewhat grandiloquently entitled "the growth of nationalism" or "collective bargaining as a means of preventing industrial disputes," merely serves to mask the fact that the human capacity for spontaneous cooperation has greatly diminished or, at least, has not kept pace with other development.

collaboration in a society cannot be left to chance. Historically and traditionally our predecessors worked for it—and succeeded. For at least a century of the most amazing scientific and material progress, we have abandoned the effort—by inadvertence, it is true—and we are now reaping the consequences. Every social group must secure for its individual and group membership:

(a) The satisfaction of economic needs.

(b) The maintenance of cooperation organized in social routines. Our methods are all pointed at efficiency; none at the maintenance of cooperation. We do know how to devise efficient methods; we do not know how to ensure spontaneity of cooperation—that is, teamwork. The latter problem is far more difficult of solution with us than in a simple or primitive community. In a simple society the extent of change from year to year, or even from century to century, may be relatively small. Traditional methods are therefore brought to a high degree of perfection; almost from birth disciplined collaboration is drilled into the individual. But in these days of rapid and continuous change the whole conception of social discipline must probably be altered. Study of the problem must begin rather as an investigation of

human happiness than as an anthropological study of ceremonial participation.

> the desire for continuous and intimate association in work with others remains a strong, possibly the strongest, human capacity. *It is the modern tragedy that the very strength of this persistent desire makes against rather than for effective cooperation.* This occurs in two ways. The first is shown in the apparent increase of obsessive thinking. This has been studied by Janet, by Freud, and by the whole mental hygiene movement in this country. The so-called maladjustment to which these authorities trace the origin of obsession is a social maladjustment. It expresses the strenuous and ineffective efforts of an unhappy individual to relate himself effectively to other persons, when he has not been trained to such relationships. Realization of his own ineffectiveness leads him to over-think the problem, to press too impatiently for some immediate and miraculous solution, and to collapse into depression when his efforts almost certainly fail.
>
> The other way in which the persistence of an instinct for association shows itself is perhaps even more important. There is no statistic to verify the estimate of a large increase in extreme cases of obsession, though all the authorities believe it. But, even if it is so, the consequent problem is small by comparison with that which arises from the intrusion of obsessive ideas into the thinking of persons essentially normal. For this means that in dealing with the already complex affairs of civilization we are faced with the partial intrusion of another, and a human, complication. The relative isolation of small groups, their constant feeling of insecure tenure, imposes upon such groups an attitude of suspicion or even hostility in their attitude to other groups, or, in industry, to management. By this road we drift downwards to what the historians call *stasis,* a disintegration of a community into an infinity of mutually hostile sections. By this road come disintegration, chaos, downfall.[1]

If the bright promise of an age of great strides in technological aspects is to be fulfilled, it is Man himself the public educator must

[1] Elton Mayo in Foreword to F. J. Roethlisberger, *Management and Morale,* Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1950, pp. xv–xvii, xix–xx, and xxi–xxii.

study to find his task and his opportunity for significant achievement. Many people in many fields have dreamed of what could be if only Man could learn to live with himself in the world which he has in part created but in which he walks uncertain and afraid. Winston Churchill has wondered if the problems of the world may not have gotten beyond our capacity for solving them. If a factor in the bringing about of a bright, new world is missing, it is doubtless a lack in Man himself who surrounds himself with wonders confounding his primitive concepts of how to make use of the powers which are his to employ.

In our own time, David Lilienthal has spoken from his knowledge of the atomic energy potential.

> We live in a world of change Inventions, discoveries, machines, change the face of the earth, change the setting of people's lives, change empires and profoundly affect peace and war. Sometimes we forget what is behind the machines and discoveries. We say this is the Atomic Age and thereby perhaps obscure the truth that like all other ages of man this is the Human Age; that behind new knowledge are individuals, human beings, men and women driven by a ceaseless urge, the desire to know, the desire to understand the world Knowledge always has a two-sided aspect. It can be used for good, for human betterment, for the making of a world in which there is less suffering, less poverty, and less misery. Or it can be used to increase jealousy and bitterness and hatred among men, used for destruction and wars. Knowledge, love, faith—with these three, the Atomic Age, the age in which you shall live, can become an age of mercy, joy, and of hope, one of the blessed periods of all human history.[2]

If the key to the accomplishment of a kind of Golden Age of Man is the development of genuinely cooperative action among all people, the obligation would seem to belong to specialists in the organizing and leading of enterprises involving the integrating of efforts of individuals working toward common ends. But if ad-

[2] David Lilienthal, high school commencement address at Gettysburg, Pennsylvania, June 1, 1948. Used by permission.

ministration in the many fields it serves is to contribute to the achievement of the better working together of people, which is to say the better *living* together of people, administration cannot be concerned solely or primarily with the management of *things* and with activities apart from the people carrying them on.

Administration has to do with getting things done; with the accomplishment of defined objectives. The science of administration is thus the system of knowledge whereby men may understand relationships, predict results, and influence outcomes in any situation where men are organized at work together for a common purpose. Public administration is that part of the science of administration which has to do with government, and thus concerns itself primarily with the executive branch, where the work of government is done, though there are obviously administrative problems also in connection with the legislative and the judicial branches. Public administration is thus a division of political science, and one of the social sciences.

At the present time administration is more an art than a science; in fact there are those who assert dogmatically that it can never be anything else. They draw no hope from the fact that metallurgy, for example, was completely an art several centuries before it became primarily a science and commenced its great forward strides after generations of intermittent advance and decline.

It is fashionable for physicists, chemists and biologists who have achieved remarkable control and great predictive accuracy in narrow areas to ridicule all the social scientists, particularly those in government, because of the small body of verified knowledge thus far accumulated and "laws" formulated outside of the field of the "exact sciences." It is even denied that there can be any "science" in social affairs. This naive attitude is perhaps not to be wondered at in a group which has so recently arrived on the scene of man's intellectual theatre and has been permitted to play such a striking role for the past two centuries. Natural science, after all, has undertaken the comparatively simple and easy task of understanding the mechanistic and mathematical relationships of the physical world and has left to philosophy, ethics, religion, education, sociology, political science, and other social

sciences the truly difficult and the truly important aspects of life and knowledge.

Social science rests at many points upon the physical sciences. Economics and politics, for example, are fundamentally conditioned by the discoveries of pure science and their technological application. The advance of certain of the exact sciences thus becomes of great concern and serves to condition and delay the advance of social science. The very fact that exact science has made a great forward surge in the past one hundred years, inevitably thrusts a whole new series of unsolved problems upon social science.

The social sciences are also mutually dependent. This is particularly true of political science because political science is not a unitary, but a co-ordinating science which deals on one side with man's political life, desires and behavior, and on the other with government and public administration in which must be utilized most if not all of the professions and sciences which man has developed.[3]

If administration of social enterprises (the public school system being the one of primary concern in this book) is an art or a science or, more likely, largely an art with some science, there should be a body of basic principles on which administrators might establish their activity. It may be thought that administration of a public school system is of a kind peculiar to itself or it may be held that *some* common principles apply to administration in whatever field it may be employed. It is not clear that anyone in any field of administration has discovered the principles underlying all such activity, but many writers have demonstrated their belief in the importance of finding those principles and establishing a theory of administration in terms of them.

It is the general thesis of this paper that there are principles which can be arrived at inductively from the study of human experience of organization, which should govern arrangements for human association of any kind. These principles can be studied as a technical ques-

[3] Luther Gulick, "Science, Values and Public Administration," *Papers on the Science of Administration,* Institute of Public Administration, New York, 1937, p. 191.

tion, irrespective of the purpose of the enterprise, the personnel composing it, or any constitutional, political or social theory underlying its creation. They are concerned with the method of subdividing and allocating to individuals all the various activities, duties and responsibilities essential to the purpose contemplated, the correlation of these activities and the continuous control of the work of individuals so as to secure the most economical and the most effective realization of the purpose.

In existing world conditions, the practical importance of this subject can scarcely be exaggerated. In every aspect of its common life humanity is registering failures and enormously costly failures in its capacity for purposeful association. The majority of all nations earnestly desire peace: the machinery of peace works haltingly and ineffectively. In country after country liberty of speech and of person are lost, because democratic institutions fail to devise an administrative structure adapted to the speed and complexity of social evolution. The world's productive equipment is manifestly capable of yielding vastly increased quantities of goods and services: millions starve because the financing and distribution of this plenty are not organized. A machine technology points to the obvious economies of large-scale units of business control: amalgamations founder because there is widespread ignorance as to the methods of managing these aggregations.[4]

Addressing himself directly to the field of school administration, Paul Mort in his book *Principles of School Administration* explained his effort to drive through the superficialities and minor activities of public school administration to a bedrock of basic theory.

As I have viewed various attempts to find solutions to administrative problems and tried my hand at some of them, I have found myself baffled by the lack of encompassing theory. No such theory has been at hand either as a basis for appraisal of the solutions of others or as a tool for illuminating the novel problems I myself have faced. It has seemed to me that the literature of our field has been piecemeal. To no small degree it is made up of rules of thumb collected from hither

[4] L. Urwick, "Organization As a Technical Problem," *Papers on the Science of Administration,* Institute of Public Administration, New York, 1937, p. 49.

and yon. Such parts of it carry no hints as to their relative importance for the principles underlying them are not apparent. Other parts of the literature deal with sets of principles or theories encompassing only a phase of administration such as budgets, accounting, building planning, and curriculum development. No matter how internally consistent these special theories may be, they do not carry the stigmata that are the keys to *relative* emphasis. What I have felt the need of is a set of internally consistent principles covering the whole range of administration.[5]

III

If Man is to live happily in the world which he has helped to create but understands dimly and fears much, values that are broadly termed *human* values must be uppermost or Man will be the victim of his own creations. Those who are the specialists (and presumably most expert) in bringing about cooperative effort toward common goals should be called upon for the contributions of administration, although it can be recognized that administrators are as yet without sure knowledge of how best to bring about cooperative action whether in business, government, education, or other field. Some have argued that underlying all administration is a body of basic principles and that administration in the separate fields contains common elements useful for the administrator of any enterprise. If that is true, the school administrator may find that his understanding is incomplete if he does not draw upon related fields for the assistance which they can give.

The field of school administration is relatively new as a special realm of study, though the practice is almost as old as civilization. In common usage, the term administration is roughly synonymous with that of management. In its proper use in education, it contains much that we mean by the word government and is closely related in content to such words as superintendence, supervision, planning, oversight, direction, organization, control, guidance, and regulation. Besides referring

[5] By permission from *Principles of School Administration,* by Paul R. Mort. Copyright, 1946. McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc. P. vii.

to the process or activity of managing people and materials, the term is regularly used to designate the person or persons, the officials, in charge of the activity.

The types of activities covered by the term administration, as it applies in the field of education, are similar—or at least quite parallel—to those covered by it in government, in industry and commerce, in institutions of religion, and in social clubs. This similarity is not so great in the actual work done or the detail of methods used, perhaps, as it is in the nature of the energizing power used, the arrangements for its use, and the effect this power has upon the nature, the operations, and the success of the enterprise.

General similarity of purpose assures, therefore, that a study of administration in any one of these fields must inevitably cover much, in principle at least, that would be essential in any of the other fields. This apparent similarity may be misleading if one tries to carry it very far, for obviously, training in municipal government would not equip a man to administer a school system or to direct the operations of a church or a factory or a bank. So, with the similarities there are important differences as well. The implications of these similarities and differences for a comprehensive theory, or for a general science of administration, have not as yet been examined carefully or at all extensively. Until this has been done, we shall not be sure whether what we call administrative principles are in reality principles or only particular inferences, or, perhaps, only tricks of the special trade.

The function of administration appears in a very simple form when someone waves or calls out a heave-ho signal, thereby directing the efforts of the many to carry on in unison to a common end. In more complicated processes, where the task involves several types of activities, specialization of work appears, and with this come planning and organization and coordination, as well as simple directing. Undoubtedly the function has developed through long centuries of time, largely by trial and error; but when an activity reaches the point where planning has become an obvious need, it is inevitable that that activity will soon become an object of systematic study and, if important enough, may become a separate subject or university discipline.

Administration attained importance in government long before it

did in education or in business; and as a branch of study, it first came to light in the field of political science and in the engineering activities of states. Its appearance as a separate study in business and in education hardly dates back to the middle of last century. Reference here is to the beginning of formal study in school and to a body of literature, including systematic treatises, researches, and highly organized bodies of information, and not to the time when men first tried to think of better ways of managing. Men have always studied their problems; and since men first wrote down their thoughts, government has been a chief object of study. But it is one thing to try to find the quickest way to get an army across a stream and a different thing to plan and build a bridge across the stream, and it is still a different thing to prepare a treatise and to give formal instruction covering the facts and principles of engineering involved in bridge construction.[6]

There are important differences among administrative tasks in the many areas where administration is essential to the outcome of an enterprise. But recognizing that in each special area there are necessary experiences and particular qualifications demanded of administrators does not lead to the conclusion that equally important common elements are absent. The activities of two administrators are not made totally, or even basically, different because one administers in a large department store and the other in a government office. Neither may be equipped to function adequately in the other's job yet within the task of each the same factors and functions of administration may be present daily. While not minimizing the differences which do exist between even two administrative positions in the same occupational area (two public school superintendencies may make quite different demands upon the holders of the positions), it may be demonstrated that *basically* two different administrative positions in two different occupational areas have very much in common.

In all administration, there is the key factor of leadership with

[6] By permission from *The Nature of the Administrative Process* by Jesse B. Sears. Copyright, 1950. McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc. Pp. 4–6.

all that the term suggests in the energizing and directing of organized group effort. Leadership may be present in greater or lesser degree and may be employed in many different ways, yet appear recognizably and necessarily in the administrative situation whatever the area. To be of service to administrators, would-be administrators, and others, studies of leadership ought not to be limited to any one or two areas of implementation if the primary concern is the theory or principles of leadership at work rather than the application of leadership techniques and procedures to particular administrative problems. It may be that many who have studied leadership as a factor in administration have confused practice and principle through trying to identify the true nature of leadership by studying *leadership in education, leadership in business,* or *leadership in government* rather than studying leadership as a social phenomenon or as an ingredient in the formation of groups. The *application* of leadership to specific problems is the proper concern of one kind of study. The nature of leadership as a concern of students of administration challenges another, a broader and deeper, investigation of social organization and function. It is in the latter interest that school administrators may call upon other fields for assistance and possible enlightenment.

To be found in all administration, however well- or ill-defined, is the factor of purpose. Integration of group effort, the appraisal of activity, and the planning of program and movement depend upon it, arise out of it, and reflect it. The factor of purpose may be hidden under its various faces of goals, objectives, aims, or psychological satisfiers. Purpose establishes direction of movement, rate of progress or accomplishment, priorities attached to objectives and, in some cases, the means or agent of action in response to the purpose or purposes. It is a factor in all administration and deserves direct consideration in the study of administrative theory and practice.

The factor of organization can be recognized as basic in administration wherever administration is manifest in group activity.

The recognition and leadership of both formal and informal organizations and the development of structures in terms of them are essential in administrative activity. The point is that both formal and informal groups, therefore *organizations,* exist everywhere where people come together in common purpose. With or without recognition of these formal and informal groups and leadership of them by the responsible administrator, they will affect in a major way the activity of the group or groups within the enterprise being carried on.

Fundamental in group associations is the factor of authority. Administration rests upon it in its many aspects. Administrators use it in many ways often with neither understanding of its real nature nor recognition of its significance in every human association. One could not list elements common to all administration without giving the factor of authority an important place on the list.

Administration is concerned with relations and actions-reactions among people as engineering is concerned with relations among members of physical structures. Throughout the enterprises to which administration is devoted is the significant behavior of people in their relations with other people. Though speaking of administration as human engineering is inexact because it is limiting, the human engineering aspects of administration are of major importance, perhaps of greatest importance, to the ventures of administration. The factor of group interaction is basic in all administrative activity.

Associated with and growing out of the five factors of leadership, purpose, organization, authority, and group interaction are five basic functions of all administration. These functions may be exemplified variously according to the nature of the enterprise and the particular task at hand. The descriptive appellation given each may be modified and functions as listed may be combined or subdivided in various ways, yet the listing serves usefully as an accounting of elements or aspects common to all administration in all fields and to whatever purposes. The five functions which are

called into being in administrative activity are *planning, communication, coordination, problem-solving,* and *evaluation.* Of each, more will be said later.

Because administration is the energizing agency in enterprises of all kinds, it must possess in every instance what may be called an *urge to do.* The urge to do may arise from grounds of self-interest, anticipated satisfactions, joy of work, service to others, patriotism, idealized social contribution, or other grounds of like variety. The urge to do may arise out of several grounds at the same time, and administrators may be motivated by a desire to make money, to render service to society, and to feel satisfaction in getting something done. It is likely that the desire to make money is greatly overrated as a motive for action and that much more fundamental is the desire of individuals to find satisfaction in service to society. But however developed, the urge to do runs through all administration strongly or weakly according to individuals and circumstances. Administration in the service of effort toward a better society is not an idle dream when the grounds for the administrator's urge to do are examined.

REFERENCES

APPLEBY, PAUL H., *Big Democracy,* Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., New York, 1945.

BAKKE, E. WRIGHT, *Bonds of Organization,* Harper & Brothers, New York, 1950.

BARNARD, CHESTER I., *The Functions of the Executive,* Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1948.

BETHEL, LAWRENCE L., ALWATER, FRANKLIN S., SMITH, GEORGE H. E., and STUCKMAN, HARVEY A. JR., *Industrial Organization and Management,* 2d ed., McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., New York, 1950.

CARTWRIGHT, DORWIN, and ZANDER, ALVIN, *Group Dynamics,* Row, Peterson and Company, Evanston, Illinois, 1953.

DALE, ERNEST, *Planning and Developing the Company Organization*

Structure, American Management Association, New York, 1952.

DAVIS, RALPH C., *The Fundamentals of Top Management,* Harper & Brothers, New York, 1951.

DEHUSZAR, GEORGE B., *Practical Applications of Democracy,* Harper & Brothers, New York, 1945.

DIMOCK, MARSHALL E., *The Executive in Action,* Harper & Brothers, New York, 1945.

DUBIN, ROBERT, *Human Relations in Administration,* Prentice-Hall, Inc., New York, 1951.

FAYOL, HENRI, *General and Industrial Management,* Sir Isaac Pitman & Sons, Ltd., London, 1949.

GARDNER, BURLEIGH B., and MOORE, DAVID G., *Human Relations in Industry,* rev. ed., Richard D. Irwin, Inc., Chicago, 1950.

GAUS, JOHN MERRIMAN, *Reflections on Public Administration,* University of Alabama Press, Univeristy, Alabama, 1947.

GULICK, LUTHER and URWICK, L. (editors), *Papers on the Science of Administration,* Institute of Public Administration, New York, 1937.

HOLDEN, PAUL E., FISH, LOUNSBERRY S., and SMITH, HUBERT L., *Top-Management Organization and Control,* McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., New York, 1951.

HOSLETT, SCHUYLER DEAN, *Human Factors in Management,* rev. ed., Harper & Brothers, New York, 1951.

INTERNATIONAL CITY MANAGERS' ASSOCIATION, *The Technique of Municipal Administration,* 3rd ed., The International City Managers' Association, Chicago, 1947.

KRECH, DAVID, and CRUTCHFIELD, RICHARD, *Theory and Problems of Social Psychology,* McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., New York, 1948.

LEIGHTON, ALEXANDER H., *The Governing of Men,* Princeton University Press, Princeton, New Jersey, 1946.

LEPAWSKY, ALBERT, *Administration,* Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., New York, 1949.

LEWIN, KURT, *Resolving Social Conflicts,* Gertrud W. Lewin (editor), Harper & Brothers, New York, 1948.

LIVINGSTON, ROBERT T., *The Engineering of Organization and Management,* McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., New York, 1949.

MARX, FRITZ MORSTEIN (editor), *Elements of Public Administration,* Prentice-Hall, Inc., New York, 1946.

MAYO, ELTON, *The Social Problems of an Industrial Civilization,* Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1945.

MORT, PAUL R., *Principles of School Administration,* McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., New York, 1946.

NEWCOMB, THEODORE M., *Social Psychology,* The Dryden Press, New York, 1950.

NEWMAN, WILLIAM, *Administrative Action,* Prentice-Hall, Inc., New York, 1951.

ROETHLISBERGER, F. J., *Management and Morale,* Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1950.

SARGENT, S. STANSFELD, *Social Psychology, An Integrative Interpretation,* The Ronald Press Company, New York, 1950.

SEARS, JESSE B., *The Nature of the Administrative Process,* McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., New York, 1950.

SHERIF, MUZAFER, *An Outline of Social Psychology,* Harper & Brothers, New York, 1948.

SIMON, HERBERT A., *Administrative Behavior,* The Macmillan Company, New York, 1947.

SLOTKIN, J. S., *Social Anthropology,* The Macmillan Company, New York, 1950.

TEAD, ORDWAY, *The Art of Administration,* McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., New York, 1951.

URWICK, L., *The Elements of Administration,* Harper & Brothers, New York, 1943.

WALKER, ROBERT A., *The Planning Function in Urban Government,* 2d ed., University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1950.

WHITE, LEONARD, *Introduction to the Study of Public Administration,* 3d ed., The Macmillan Company, New York, 1948.

CHAPTER II

The Factor of Leadership in Administration

Is the group structure under democratic leadership the same as it would be under authoritarian leadership?

What principles are there to guide the democratic leader?

Might ability in leadership be distributed widely among individuals who may not be aware of their ability?

Is autocratic leadership essentially different from democratic leadership?

Is the leader in a truly democratic situation necessary to the accomplishment of group purposes? Is he more or less necessary to the group than if an authoritarian situation prevailed?

Do leaders come to the fore because of opportunity and favorable situation, or are they leaders because of what they *are,* regardless of opportunity or situation?

Can leaders be identified before they assume leadership roles in formal or informal group organizations?

I

Studies of leaders and leadership have intrigued researchers for a long time. The search has been sometimes for particular qualities or traits in the personalities of leaders, sometimes for particular ways of doing things in the leadership role, sometimes for environmental factors which seem to have been influential in making one person a leader and another a follower. Most promising have been

studies of group structure and behavior with special attention to the development of leaders within the group.

Two difficulties that block the study of leadership in a democracy have been evident. One difficulty is the assumption that *leadership* is an *x* something in the person of the leader setting him apart from other people, a something which he possesses either by birth (a born leader) or by development through experience. In the light of modern concepts in psychology, it is obvious that research addressed to identifying a leadership characteristic as such is headed into a blind alley.

The other difficulty is the common concept of a leader as a boss, king, emperor, ruler, commander, superior, or the like in an essentially authoritarian situation with perhaps kindly overtones in recognition of the personalities of the followers. Under this concept, democratic leadership is seen as softened authoritarianism with the leader using persuasion and argument rather than force to gain his ends. The thought of every member of a group being at times a leader would be rejected as an obvious impossibility and as theoretical mumbo jumbo. The difference between authoritarian and democratic leadership is held only as a difference in the methods by which the leader's purposes are achieved.

But leadership is not something possessed. *Leadership is a process* through which one person or a group affects the behavior of other persons or other groups. As a process, leadership may be used well or badly, effectively or ineffectively, by individuals or by groups. It may be employed within a group by first one person and then another. Leadership as a process may involve various ways and means according to the situation as the leader senses it. One leader may employ only a few procedures and instruments, selected because of his skill in using them and because of his previous success in their use. Another leader may have skill in the effective employment of many procedures and many instruments. One finds persuasion the best method. Another finds that making demands

upon others accomplishes the behavior he wants. Another plays upon the emotions of people he leads. Another manipulates persons through acting upon relationships between individuals and between groups. The most highly skilled leader probably has available to him a wide range of procedures and instruments to fit all conceivable situations. The least effective and least skilled leader probably has one or two techniques which he uses in the leadership process. The former is effective in effecting behavior changes in many kinds of people with many kinds of personality characteristics. The latter is effective with a few people in a few situations.

Ability to lead seems not to be isolationable. It appears as a concomitant of other abilities and characteristics of the person. While many attempts have been made to list abilities, qualities, traits, or characteristics of leaders, the attempts have not resulted in anything particularly useful in guiding the development of potential leaders. The difficulty is that the aspects of a person's being appear in structure, configuration, or constellation and it is not the possession of this or that aspect which is important but rather it is the personality as a whole composed of the various aspects in relation one to the other. One might suppose two persons each given the same amounts (if quantitative analysis may be presumed) of identified aspects of the personality. One might be an able leader because his attributes of personality are so organized that his personality as a whole contributes to his success in affecting the behavior of people around him in ways he would desire. The other person might be much less able as a leader because his personality configuration is different despite the fact that he possesses the same personality aspects. Our knowledge of the individual differences of persons would lead us to conclude that the difference in ability to lead would be a difference in organization of the person rather than in the possession or lack of certain attributes of the personality. It follows also that two persons might be equally successful

in employing the process of leadership in their group relationships while using quite different procedures and instruments because of their different personality patterns.

It does appear that ability to lead may be developed and that through leading one learns to lead. The often-repeated assertion that one who would lead must first learn to follow seems to have little to recommend it. It is far better to urge that one who would lead in large enterprises must first learn to lead in small ones. The leader-follower relationship is a psychological one and the successful leader must be skillful in applied psychology; sensitive to the effect on other persons of his personality, bearing, and actions; ready to make adjustments in his relationships as the changing situations require. Some or even much of the generalized ability to accomplish satisfying human relationships may be inborn. However, much may be acquired through experience in association with other people and cultivated consciously throughout the life of the individual.

In any process, the product will vary according to the skill employed and according to the adequacy of the instruments used. Both factors are subject to improvement through study and practice although not every person will be successful in high degree even at the peak of his performance. Every man may be a leader but not every man can use the leadership process to high effectiveness.

Leadership is far more than a mere position; it is the integration of a group of qualities into a pattern of behavior. The position of leader is merely a blank space in an organization chart; a three-dimensional function to be performed upward, downward, and across. Every position carries with it a tradition of leadership that has little to do with the person occupying it. In the Army and the Navy, the uniform, not the man wearing it, is saluted. Any position carries with it an original response from those on the lower level. Any person to whom authority and responsibility have been delegated carries some authority not of himself but of his position.

The person who originates and organizes a plan will have a follow-

ing because of that very fact. No matter how incompetent he may prove to be in carrying his ideas into execution, there will be an original response. But there is a very real difference between a position and the functionary occupying it and between an original and a continuing response.

In order for a leader to function effectively and to get the best response from those led, he should possess the ability to inspire favorable responses.

The leadership pattern is that particular set of qualities, in an authority, which, under a given set of circumstances, will cause a particular group of people to act harmoniously toward a common end under his direction. This rather ponderous definition is designed to indicate that, fundamentally, people choose their leader. He is the person whom others will follow. It is quite probable, on the other hand, that people primarily pursue a common objective rather than follow a given leader. It may be that the leader epitomizes within himself the common objective and the people apparently follow him. But actually, the authority of leadership springs from the consent of those led.

Leadership involves some emotional feeling from the person led to the leader. It may be love, admiration, respect, or confidence. It implies some form of reliance or faith in the leader on the part of the follower. Ideally it implies inspiration. There are many reasons why people will follow a leader, but usually they think that under him they will obtain satisfaction of some of their fundamental wants. He is able to persuade his subordinates (or make them persuade themselves) that they can best realize their desires by acting concertedly under his direction. If it is to continue, leadership must be founded upon an understanding of the capacities, ideas, emotions, needs, and wants, both collectively and individually, of those led.

People follow a leader because they are confident in him and his ability. They continue to follow because he demonstrates that the confidence is well placed.

Leadership, then, is that group of characteristics which, when exercised, cause other people voluntarily to accept the exerciser as their leader. All the reasons that cause this acceptance can be summed up as belief and confidence: belief that the leader epitomizes the ideals of

the group and confidence that he is the best person to realize their goal.[1]

The leadership role may be passed from one member of a group to another with the most effective leaders holding positions of leadership for much of the time during which the group exists. The role is assigned by the group members who must be persuaded or coerced or otherwise led to accept one of their number as the leader of the group. In most cases, the selection of a leader comes about in the formation of the group as the individuals who are to become group members cluster together. The leader may not consciously seek the position of leadership and yet his personality and other attributes are such that his fellows defer to him, allow his opinions to color theirs, and prefer to align their actions with his.

In informal group activity, the group is formed about a leader. It persists until the group purposes are achieved or until disinterest or failure or other disintegrating factors set in. The group may be reformed, or another group formed, about the same leader or another leader for other purposes equally vaguely realized or equally clearly formulated.

The leadership role is assigned out of a situation and ordinarily various individuals are assigned the role as different situations arise. However, the leadership position given to one person tends to persist through varied situations if the group membership remains essentially the same. In a closely knit group such as a boys' gang, the leader remains the leader of the gang through many different group activities and loses his role only through his departure from the gang. In such a tightly structured group, his departure would bring about the dissolution of the gang, although its remaining members might organize another gang under different leadership.

Formal groups may be formed out of informal groups but or-

[1] By permission from *The Engineering of Organization and Management* by Robert T. Livingston. Copyright, 1949. McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc. Pp. 202–203.

dinarily are independently constituted. The teachers in a school compose a formal group within which or parallel to which will be informal groups. The formal group is structured most often without regard to individual personalities, whereas the genesis of informal groups is in the individual personalities and their relationships. The principal of the school is appointed to his position independently of the group though perhaps with group concurrence and approval. Once appointed, he becomes titular leader of the group by reason of his position. He may indeed be actively opposed by the members of the group and yet retain his position as leader through deference given the formal position of school principal. His leadership will of course be limited to the activity of the group as formally constituted. His effectiveness as a leader will be conditioned by his being accepted as a leader in informal group relationships as well. Therefore, while the newly appointed administrator may assume with confidence the role of titular leader of the school group and may know that no one will challenge him in the role as long as he retains his official position, he must also gain the role of leader which is granted by the group to one who is more than its leader by title. In having the formal role given him, he starts with an advantage over other possible leaders, but he cannot retain the advantage in the long run unless he takes steps to establish his leadership in terms of group-granted authority. That is the proof of his ability to lead, the test of his use of the leadership process.

To achieve the more significant position in the group, he will need to concern himself about *group* action toward *group* purposes. He will need to exercise his leadership in giving expression to group wants which he senses but recognizes as being unformulated and unexpressed. He will need to structure situations for the group so that direction, purpose, and choice of action may be determined by the group. In doing these things, he will need to be sensitive to the situations in the group life and to the complex human relationships existing in the situations. He will need to exercise his leader-

ship in many ways in support of group purposes and with group approval. Knowing that in a democracy the leadership role is assigned by the group and may be taken away by the group, he will need continually to hold his activity as leader against the criteria of group needs and desires.

II

Common in the literature of school administration is the listing of various traits or qualities thought by someone to be characteristic of leaders of various kinds, and thus possibly useful traits or qualities of school administrators. The fact that many successful leaders do not seem to possess all traits or qualities deemed important to leadership does not appear sufficient always to counteract belief of some students of administration that even if the traits of leaders as contrasted to those of non-leaders are not known they ought to be known and surely must exist. Gouldner puts the case for avoiding the "trait approach" in studies of leadership.

Since the trait approach has in many ways exercised an important influence on thinking about leadership, examination of some of its findings and assumptions will further serve to orient this work. Trait studies of leadership can be classified in many ways. Two that seem most useful from the present point of view are: (1) classification of trait analyses of leadership in terms of the method of study used; and (2) the relationship that is assumed to exist between the traits of leaders and the group or situational context.

In terms of the first method of classifying trait studies, two major categories may be found: first, the impressionistic accounts and, second, the experimental studies employing forms of controlled observation. Both kinds of studies were alike, of course, in that they were guided by their use of this concept. Each author tended to conclude his work with a list of adjectives (or trait-names) of varying length and content.

The inadequacies of the above type of trait studies can be only briefly summarized here. Leaving aside questions concerning their investigational technique, the following points may be raised:

1. Those proposing trait lists usually do not suggest which of the traits are most important and which least. Not uncommonly, lists of more than ten traits are presented. In most such lists it seems very unlikely that each of the traits is equally important and deserves the same weighting. Bearing in mind that practical application of leadership studies (as, for example, in leadership selection or training) requires compromises due to time limitations and the number of candidates available, the failure to indicate the rank order of importance of the traits makes it difficult to know *at what points* compromises may be made. It is only within very recent years that the work of trait-analysts, like Raymond Cattell, gives promise of coping with this problem.

2. It is evident, too, that some of the traits mentioned in a single list are not mutually exclusive. For example, Miller lists tact, judgment, and common sense as leadership traits. It would seem, ordinarily, that the first two would be included in the last.

3. Trait studies usually do not discriminate between trait facilitating *ascent* to leadership and those enabling it to be maintained. It seems to be assumed that all the traits which differentiate leaders from followers are functional to ongoing leadership. It appears entirely possible, however, that certain of the traits of leaders were necessary conditions for success in the *competition to become* a leader but are not needed by an *established* leadership.

4. Typically, most trait studies, and those of leadership are no exception, raise questions concerning the organization of behavior, the range of recurring behavior patterns manifested by individuals. They are largely descriptive. Usually they do not ask how these traits *develop,* or how the behavior *became* organized. Thus, in so many of the trait studies there is the tacit assumption that the leaders' traits existed *prior* to their ascendance to leadership. It is therefore inferred that the leaders' possession of these traits are to help explain how he became a leader.

Even in some of the trait studies which maintain that leadership traits are specific to the situation, that the situation makes them useful, it appears to be assumed that the individual *already possesses* the useful traits when he enters into leadership. The possibility that the reverse is true, namely, that it is the leadership position which fosters the *origi-*

nal emergence of distinctive traits, is hardly ever systematically explored. In sum, one usually is not informed whether, and which, leadership traits exist before and which develop after leadership is assumed.

5. Finally, the study of the personalities of leaders, as of any other group of individuals, in terms of *traits* involves certain debatable assumptions regarding the nature of personality. It seems to be believed that the leader's personality can be, or is, described if all the traits by which it is composed are determined. Implicit is the notion that a personality is the sum of its component traits. This would seem, however, to ignore one of the fundamental properties of personality, its possession of *organization.* The same "trait" will function differently in personalities which are organized differently. To characterize the *component elements* of an entity such as personality is an insufficient description in that it omits consideration of the fact that these elements have varying *positions* or *arrangements.* It is only when attention is paid to arrangement or position that organization, as such, can be brought into account.

Most trait studies, flowing from the empiricist tradition, have approached the study of personality atomistically, and with little regard for personality as an organized whole. Not being oriented to any systematic theory of personality, they have pursued the "facts" of personality only to find that empiricism can be just as treacherous a guide as the most speculative of theoretical systems. It is, in part, because of the lack of any theoretical guide lines that the trait studies of leadership have produced relatively little convergence. Some scholars, for example, speak of two, ten, nineteen, and some of thirty, traits of leadership.[2]

But if the trait approach to the study of leadership is useless, the question arises as to what other approach can be made. The answer is not entirely clear though one may assume that the study of leadership as process might be profitable. In the field of school administration, though more particularly in business administration, the case-study method has been employed to some advantage although there are serious shortcomings, including the tendency to

[2] Alvin W. Gouldner (editor), *Studies in Leadership,* Harper & Brothers, New York, 1950, pp. 21–22, 23–25.

accept as desirable or sound whatever is most widely practiced. The problem in that approach is to find out what leadership *does* not what it *is*. Since definition may be in terms of function, the approach through study of practice and process does offer a route, though perhaps devious and possibly misleading, toward a definition of the nature of leadership in terms of specific situations and applications. Not all answers are to be found through discovering what administrators do and how they do it, but a list such as Hoslett's suggestions of methods by which a leader may direct and control the behavior of others is a useful, though partial, analysis.

In terms of our frame of reference, there are four methods which a leader may use for directing the activities of people:

1. *Force*—the leader uses his control of means to force the choice of certain activities which he desires as means. The alternative to following him is reduction of need satisfaction.
2. *Paternalism*—the leader provides means, and hopes for acceptance of his leadership out of loyalty and gratitude.
3. *Bargain*—the leader may arrive at a bargain, a more or less voluntary choice, made by each party to furnish certain means in return for certain means.
4. *Mutual means*—the leader creates the situation in which certain activities of his and of the group, if performed together, will serve as mutual means, means for each to satisfy their own (perhaps different) needs.

The appointed leader, however, is not free to choose among these methods. To a greater or less extent the method is prescribed by the policy of the organization in which he leads. In general today in industrial organizations the method lies somewhere in the region between force and bargaining. The initial concept of leadership in industry seems to have been that of force. Paternalism enjoyed popularity for many years among some managers; it is generally frowned upon but widely practiced today. The rise of unions made possible the opposition of force to force and created the necessity for bargaining.

Today bargaining is the common method used by management to obtain direction of those activities necessary to management's objec-

tives. The appointed leader, endowed with such management "prerogatives"—means control—as management has been able to salvage at the bargaining table, is expected to lead. What leading means will depend on the attitude of his top management and its policy. The frame of reference within which he must lead has been established over a considerable period and is fixed in the attitudes of his subordinates as well as his superiors. Yet he is exhorted to be a good leader; he is trained to use this or that technique; his effectiveness is examined through morale surveys. He is prompted to be tough, to be fair, to use consultative supervision but to retain management rights. The dilemma of the appointed leader is simply that he must succeed as a leader despite the fact that he cannot control the conditions in terms of which he leads.

The essence of leadership lies in the functional relationship between leader and followers. When the conditions of the relationship are established not by the leader but by the policy of the organization, and when that policy favors the "or else" method, or paternalism, or a grudging and hostile bargaining method, the leader is on the spot. He appears to be on the spot in many cases today in industry. In fact, the methods of force and bargaining seem to be somewhat on the spot also. Although force can be used to control the activities of people, it engenders opposing force, and it often defeats its own purpose.

The method of bargaining backed by force is beginning to seem inadequate even to those who cannot conceive of an alternative. When bargaining rests on mutual respect and force has dropped out, the situation is not too bad. In such cases the mutuality of means which exists, although tenuous, becomes more apparent. "The greater the profits of the company, the larger the cut to labor" idea.

From there to the fourth method is not too impossible a step, although it requires skill, understanding and imagination of a very high order. When management successfully creates the necessary conditions, the organization and its objective become a means not only to management but also to labor. Through this mutual means each satisfies needs. A leader in this situation is a man whose direction of activities is an effective aid for all concerned to attain their objectives. Under such circumstances, the dilemma of the appointed leader disappears.[3]

[3] Schuyler Dean Hoslett (editor), *Human Factors in Management,* rev. ed., Harper & Brothers, New York, 1951, pp. 20–22.

Individual leaders vary, of course, in the skill with which they employ the methods of leadership. It is likely that skill can be developed through experience and that a leader inefficient in exercising the power which he has may learn through working with others how best to make his leadership function. The configuration of the personality of the leader no doubt is a primary factor in his success or failure, and as the configuration changes so perhaps may change for better or worse his understanding of the processes of leadership and his ability to employ them effectively. Since leadership is a phenomenon of social groups, its exercise is through people. The administrator's skill in handling people may be the measure of his administrative ability. Urwick suggests that the test of the administrator is the degree to which he can stimulate others to constructive and cooperative participation in a group enterprise.

> In the initiative of all working within an enterprise directed freely and energetically towards its objectives, the highest quality of administration finds its most significant reward. It is fundamental to organizations composed of human beings, and the point which distinguishes them from all mechanical structures, that there is no motive power other than the will and determination of each individual participating in the undertaking.
>
> The degree to which he can elicit the constructive qualities in the personnel of all grades and stimulate them to a spontaneous and ordered and co-operative effort to carry out both the immediate and wider purposes of the undertaking is *the* test of the administrator. The man who can impose *his* will on others may succeed up to a point by dint of forcefulness and industry. But the motive power of the enterprise will be limited to the drive he can impart: it will always be a one-man power organisation. The man who can focus and thereby magnify the wills of all associated with him is a leader. He interprets the purposes of a great undertaking in terms which reach the understanding and inspire the enthusiasm of all ranks, so that his will and theirs are one. He becomes the fulcrum which gives leverage to the collective will. He commands a power out of all proportion greater than the individualist leader.

That is why the greatest crime the administrator can commit is to be too authoritative, too impatient of criticism and discussion, too quick to resent as disloyalty frank difference of opinion as to policy. Disloyalty arises when decisions have been taken, in lack of energy in implementing them, never in the processes through which they are formulated. To treat opposition as something to be crushed or swept aside is to start the insidious process by which candid officials are turned into "yes-men," creatures who first enquire what will be "liked" by their superiors before formulating their own views, who have lost the taste for honesty when thinking about the affairs of the organisation. Once that process is started it will corrupt a whole undertaking like a leprosy. The direction will be robbed of the greatest contribution the personnel can make to the undertaking, unbiased and fearless statement of the best thought of which they are capable. Enthusiasm will be stifled, ability frustrated and energy turned inwards to concentrate on self-seeking. The administrator who gives way to the temptation to use his authority to suppress rather than to develop the views of his subordinates is committing the sin against the Holy Ghost.[4]

Roethlisberger places consideration of the human factor high among the imperatives in industrial administration.

Industry is a social as well as an economic phenomenon. An industrial concern is not only an organization for the promotion of economic purposes; it is also a human organization in which the hopes and aspirations of individuals are trying to find expression. In these terms the leader of an industrial enterprise has two functions to fulfill, an economic function and a social function. First, he has to manufacture and distribute a product at a profit. Second, he has to keep individuals and groups of individuals working effectively together. A great deal of attention has been given to the first function. Scientific controls have been introduced to further the economic purposes of a concern and of the individuals within it. Much of this advance has gone on in the name of efficiency or rationalization. Nothing comparable to this advance has gone on in the personal relations between employer and em-

[4] L. Urwick, *The Elements of Administration,* Harper & Brothers, New York, 1943, pp. 88–89.

ployee. Whatever slight advance there may have been is completely overshadowed by the new and powerful technology of modern industry. One important reason for this difference is not difficult to find. Effective relations between employer and employee largely reside in skills that are personal, empirical, and intuitive—skills which the individual utilizing them cannot make very explicit. Unlike the skills developed in the technological area, they are difficult to communicate. To them science has been little applied.

Numberless examples could be cited to show that these two skills, technical skill and skill in dealing with human relations, do not necessarily go hand in hand in the same individual. There are some men highly intelligent and logical within their areas of specialty who at the same time are bunglers in the art of human relations. Likewise, there are some men highly skilled in the handling of people for whose logical capacities one can have little respect. That high logical skill and skill in handling people do not necessarily go together suggests that they are concerned with different factors. It suggests that, in handling human relations, logic alone will not avail.[5]

The consideration of people and their behavior runs through every task of administration. Even in an extended treatment of the administrator as organizer, Mooney finds it necessary to break off his discourse to insert a reminder of the fundamental nature of the administrator's work with people within the organization: "But the qualities of leadership involve more than the capacities of the organizer; they demand the psychic qualities of the leader. This phase of leadership is as vital as the spirit of cooperation itself. It is in fact the operating phase of this process, since it is the leader who must coordinate not only the jobs but the people by whom the jobs are filled."[6]

But coordination of many individual efforts comes through the free will of the individual rather more than through control, coercion, and penalty which can be imposed. Under best conditions of

[5] F. J. Roethlisberger, *Management and Morale,* Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1950, pp. 27–28.

[6] James D. Mooney, *The Principles of Organization,* Harper & Brothers, New York, 1939, p. 15.

group functioning, individual group members lend their strength to the group enterprise because they enjoy working with others, accept the purposes of the enterprise as their own, feel that their own direct contributions to the enterprise are important to it, and identify their own successes or failures with the successes or failures of the enterprise as a whole. In this way, the individual acquires a sense of belonging to the organization and of the organization's project as belonging to him. The sense of personal identification with the group enterprise is not difficult to arouse in small groups and simple organizations. In large organizations, personal identification with the common effort is more difficult because the individual usually cannot see the whole process from his vantage point in the organization and may feel that his particular task is lost in a great stream of activities. Purposes, direction, and accomplishment of the organization do not seem to be pertinent to his occupation within it. The concept of the little man caught in a giant enterprise in which his job has neither beginning nor end but only *is* is a concept of an industrial civilization where bigness of enterprise is commonplace, but where the individual, whatever his role in the organization, finds himself burdened with the sense of being overwhelmed by the magnitude of the activity in which he can share but little.

Cooperation in a group activity is not a mere lending of effort, an acquiescence, a limited participation. Cooperation calls upon individuals to identify themselves and their contributions with an organizational pattern of structure and function which could not be complete were they or their contributions missing. The sharing in the developing of purpose and plan, in the effort to accomplish a recognized objective, in the evaluation of accomplishment, in joy at success and in sorrow at failure characterize cooperation as the joining-together of free men in service toward a common end. Some may call leadership toward such cooperation democratic leadership, and it may well be so designated. But whether the leadership is toward the full partnership of individuals working to-

gether, or toward the acceptance by individuals in a large organization of roles as members of a family in which the leadership is paternalistic rather than more clearly democratic (consider the device of a large corporation which speaks of all its employees as the *family* of United States Steel), the desire is the self-identification of the individual with the organization and its program.

In the long run, the administrator as leader must face the necessity of each group member's finding life satisfactions in working with the group. It often appears that an administrator "gets things done" by overriding the wills of individuals, or by deception, intimidation, or self-serving persuasion causes them to follow his lead. To the shortsighted, this is the pragmatic test of leadership. To the more discerning, it may appear that the imposition of the leader's will upon the group weakens the ability of the group to engage in cooperative activity. Tead identifies "little Hitlers" as pathological problems in administration.

What is the trouble with holding power permanently by methods of domination? The answer is clear. It requires unquestioned obedience, absence of criticism, removal of the disobedient or disloyal from the scene by more or less ruthless measures, and usually some exaggerated attempt to make the constituency believe that they are deriving real benefits from being ruled. These all yield eventual negative responses of anxiety and fear from those being dealt with. And such unproductive reactions come even more quickly where workers see evidence of few if any benefits, or where they can anticipate none, or where what few benefits there are have come to be taken for granted.

Sullen indifference and passive, reluctant acquiescence are the fruits of arbitrary command. And where the arbitrary becomes the cruel or the terrorizing, there arises the more serious hazard of active resistance and finally of open revolt. Experience is historically conclusive that in the long run *efforts to seize and exercise too ruthless a power over others are self-defeating.* The tyrant—of varying degrees of severity—has a transitory power; he is so readily tempted to overreach himself that he sooner or later alienates the support with which he may have started and which is necessary for even nominal effectiveness.

Even where those dominated may not be in a position directly to effect the removal of the one in command if his rule is too objectionable, they have other effective ways to nullify his influence. This is true, for example, in current corporate life when executives or foremen are unduly highhanded. Such autocrats may be retained indefinitely, but workers may also resign, or they may "get away with" as little work as possible to the detriment of output and morale; and in a crisis an accumulation of grievances may lead them to strike.

In the general atmosphere of a democratic society the fact is that normally a too strong dose of domination will not be stomached for long. In self-interest the power holder has to make some pretense of serving those under him. Ruthless bossing is so obviously using others to advance the ends of the autocrat rather than having any concern for individuals as ends in themselves that the boss is now rightfully suspect. Increasingly the search is for those who can wield personal power in directive posts in more appealing ways.

In the setting of today's corporate life, however, the gravest danger comes from those at all executive levels who are adroit enough to wield great power in ways that are pathological, however plausible and effective their bossing methods may momentarily appear. That dictators can conceal for a time their purposes and the objectionable results of their methods is well known. A lesson about the pathology of dictatorship has recently been taught on a world scale, which has been useful for us all in lesser situations. The psychopathic power lusts of a Hitler have supplied a symbolic instance of the identifiable symptoms of all the "little Hitlers," who in lesser degree and in our domestic settings can still work havoc in hogging power for selfish ends. The characteristics of the "fuehrer" thus identify for all to see the stigmas of the excesses of personal power against which the people of a democracy and the managers and workers in its corporate bodies have to be constantly on their guard.

In our domestic scene organizational life is on occasion involved with pathological administrators who manifest just such abnormalities, of which the following are the most familiar: They give evidence of obsessive fixed ideas, delusions of grandeur, belief that they are being specially persecuted (by government, labor unions or their associates),

profound fears of their own inadequacy, which give rise to bold gestures of superiority and infallibility, passions of temper and vindictiveness, the need to make others suffer, the need to redress a sense of not being impressive due to short stature or other supposed or actual physical defect, the conviction that influences beyond their control are the cause of all their troubles (the "Reds," the "bureaucrats," the "New Deal," "outside agitators"), the need to "take it out on" others by all sorts of minor persecutions, arbitrary and willful disciplines and fussy interferences with the details of work which others have under way.

Indeed, this last manifestation is perhaps the single most common offense against the wholesome direction of people. It is evidenced in those cases where people in power have frustrations and maladjustments arising from difficulties *in the nonworking phases of their lives* and are trying to work off some of these emotional disturbances by the unfortunate ways in which they dominate those whom they direct. The fact that this behavior and the reasons for it are usually not realized by the afflicted executive does not make the situation any easier to handle.[7]

The leader of a group finds his functions in terms of the group organization (that is, according to its being essentially a freely cooperative group or a leader-dominated group) and in terms of the complexity of the organizational structure. His own philosophy of leadership leads him to discharge his functions in a way that is his own even in situations where the organization and accepted practices are contrary to his wishes. In his capacity of group leader, he must play several roles.

In any organization, the administrator as leader has functions which are his by virtue of his position in the organization and of the compulsions which lie upon anyone who assumes the role of leader in either a formal or informal organization. The listing of general functions of administrators may involve the student in either or both of two difficulties. One is the tendency in a brief list to oversimplify the complex relationships, and therefore the functions, of an administrator to the situation in which he must play his

[7] By permission from *The Art of Administration* by Ordway Tead. Copyright, 1951. McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc. Pp. 120–121, 122–123.

role and accomplish his task as leader. The other is the difficulty to be met in listing as discrete functions what are actually aspects of a total function not separable into parts discharged outside of the whole. At the end of such lists as those of Tead and Gulick which follow should be a note that all the listed functions are discharged at the same time and as one activity, although the administrator may turn his attention chiefly to one or the other at a given time. A railroad locomotive thrusts its way along the rails because many things happen at once and in the correct relationship and with effects nicely balanced to cause the locomotive to accomplish the task for which it was designed. The analogy is not perfect, but administration may be better understood as a locomotive with the administrator as energizer and coordinator of efforts delivered simultaneously than as a bundle of separate activities with the administrator doing first this then that part of his task. Tead is careful to introduce his list of administrative functions as elements of a *total process.*

In the literature and in the best practice there has come to be approximate consensus of view as to the several elements which together define the responsibilities of administration as a total process. These elements are as follows:

1. To define and set forth the purposes, aims, objectives or ends of the organization.
2. To lay down the broad plan for the structuring of the organization.
3. To recruit and organize the executive staff as defined in the plan.
4. To provide a clear delegation and allocation of authority and responsibility.
5. To direct and oversee the general carrying forward of the activities as delegated.
6. To assure that a sufficient definition and standardization of all positions have taken place so that quantity and quality of performance are specifically established and are assuredly being maintained.
7. To make provisions for the necessary committees and conferences

and for their conduct in order to achieve good coordination among major and lesser functional workers.

8. To assure stimulation and the necessary energizing of the entire personnel.
9. To provide an accurate evaluation of the total outcome in relation to established purposes.
10. To look ahead and forecast as to the organization's aims as well as the ways and means toward realizing them, in order to keep both ends and means adjusted to all kinds of inside and outside influences and requirements.[8]

Well known to students of administration in many fields is the coined word POSDCORB by which Luther Gulick keys his list of administrative functions. His analysis is useful though subject to the weaknesses of any attempt to separate the totality of administrative activity into component activities which have meaning only in relationship to the whole.

This brings us directly to the question, "What is the work of the chief executive? What does he do?"

The answer is POSDCORB.

POSDCORB is, of course, a made-up word designed to call attention to the various functional elements of the work of a chief executive because "administration" and "management" have lost all specific content. POSDCORB is made up of the initials and stands for the following activities:

Planning, that is working out in broad outline the things that need to be done and the methods for doing them to accomplish the purpose set for the enterprise;

Organizing, that is the establishment of the formal structure of authority through which work subdivisions are arranged, defined and coordinated for the defined objective;

Staffing, that is the whole personnel function of bringing in and training the staff and maintaining favorable conditions of work;

Directing, that is the continuous task of making decisions and em-

[8] Ordway Tead, *The Art of Administration,* McGraw-Hill Book Company, New York, 1951, p. 105.

bodying them in specific and general orders and instructions and serving as the leader of the enterprise;

Co-ordinating, that is the all important duty of inter-relating the various parts of the work;

Reporting, that is keeping those to whom the executive is responsible informed as to what is going on, which thus includes keeping himself and his subordinates informed through records, research and inspection;

Budgeting, with all that goes with budgeting in the form of fiscal planning, accounting and control.[9]

III

Leadership is a phenomenon of administration. It is, however, not always to be found in connection with administration except as a leadership role is ascribed to an administrative position.

Leadership is a social phenomenon associated with the formation and continuance of groups of people in formal or informal relationship. In groups which are forming, the position of leader is assigned by the group. Even the dictator is given the role of leader initially by a group, though he may endeavor to bring about the desired gift of position by intimidation, physical force, or persuasion. Once the group has assigned him the position of leader, the dictator may try to prevent the group from turning from him to another. He may use intimidation, physical force, and persuasion to maintain his position and drive claimants to it away.

In democratic group relationships, the leader emerges from the group by being assigned the leadership role formally by election or informally by the tacit consent of the other group members. But as the group assigns him the place of leader, so it may remove him as another leader appears. An important difference between the undemocratic, authoritarian holding of a position of leadership and the holding of leadership in a democratic group is that in the latter the situation is fluid permitting the leadership role to be assigned

[9] Luther Gulick, "Notes on the Theory of Organization," *Papers on the Science of Administration,* Institute of Public Administration, New York, 1937, p. 13.

first to one person then to another with changes accomplished easily and for the most part smoothly. But under a dictatorship, the normally fluid group processes of selecting leaders are interfered with in an attempt to prevent the leadership assignment from being taken away from the current holder of it. Since the leader even in the most closely controlled situation must persuade as well as compel his group members to hold him as leader, the essential weakness of a position dependent upon a static social situation which cannot be maintained for long is revealed. Change when it comes, as it must come with the aging of the dictator and the boiling up of resentments from under suppression, is violent, with dictators overthrown and would-be dictators contesting bloodily for power. The orderly change through democratic practices is a strength of democratically constituted groups which is not always realized.

In formal organizations in which leadership has been established and operative for a long period of time, leadership and administrative positions may be separate manifestations of organizational life. The real leaders of the organization may be content to permit other persons to sit in administrative positions under the influence of the leaders. Elected officers may come and go as terms of office pass, but the true leaders maintain their leadership without formal office. To some extent, the same may be true of a business organization or a school system or a governmental administration, although in such formal organizations specific duties and powers are usually attached to administrative offices and the incumbents necessarily carry on tasks associated with leadership in the organizations.

The school administrator holds the authority attached to his office and receives deference as a status leader. But if he is to act in the full role of leader in the school organization, he must *earn* the place of a leader whose assignment is from the group he leads. Without such earned place as leader, he cannot be completely effective in accomplishing his goals as leader. As an appointed leader,

he will find his position for the most part unchallenged in any way and he will receive status as leader until removed from his post by the agency which appointed him. With the advantage of a formal appointment, he can usually establish himself as a group-assigned leader also if he associates himself with the group as a member and lets the group process of selecting one of its members as leader go on normally. Because of his position as status leader appointed by the school board, the school administrator has both advantages and disadvantages in achieving the group leadership. The tendency is to grant him authority from the group simply because he has already been designated formally as leader. But, on the other hand, his formal appointment may, despite his earnest desire to be considered a regular member of the group, set him apart from the others in their own eyes. The superintendent of schools may honestly consider himself a teacher among teachers and do all in his power to act in that capacity yet find that the teachers with whom he must work refuse him acceptance in their group. The good will existent between the superintendent of schools and other teachers in the system does not necessarily alter his being held as one apart from the group, however much he would like to be integrated with it.

The school administrator who would be a real leader of the school organization has need to be a sociologist and psychologist, a student always of the behavior of people. Without a considerable understanding of why people behave as they do, the administrator may find his leadership defeated and his cherished projects wrecked on their course though he apply all the techniques he has learned. Knickerbocker's discussion of leadership illustrates the point.

> Let us ask some questions concerning the individuals in the group.
>
> Why are the individuals in the group?
>
> Because through it or through the leader they anticipate finding means for satisfying needs (or means for protecting themselves against a threatened loss of need satisfaction). If we run over groups that we

know well, such as a labor union, a church, a business association, a social club, etc., we seem to find that we joined such groups because they appeared to offer means. We leave them when they no longer seem to do so.

Why do the individuals accept direction of their activities?

Because this behavior appears to them to provide means for the satisfaction of their needs. The leader is seen as a means; through the relationship with him, needs are satisfied (or a reduction in need satisfaction is prevented). The leader may promise a chicken in every pot, a glorious future, or more money for less work. If the group member sees satisfaction of needs in the direction the leader indicates, if he believes the leader will serve as a means for getting those satisfactions, the group member follows. On the other hand, the leader may say "follow me, or disaster may befall you," "follow me, or I'll see to it that you rue the day you refuse," "follow me or else. Again if the group member believes that the leader controls the relevant means, if the group member sees a threat to his available means in failing to go in the directions the leader indicates, the group member follows. The individual then is related to the leader as a means to need satisfaction or as a means to protect available means from reduction. He follows and permits his activities to be directed because he believes that to do so will get him what he wants.

Why does the leader arise?

Even in the simplest situation, such as when a group embarks on discussion which will eventuate in a decision of some sort, a leader seems to be essential. Operationally, it is difficult for a group to speak or act except through an individual member. If everyone talks at once, no one can hear or attend. If everyone plans at once, or acts at once without a plan, there is no group but rather a collection of individuals planning or acting. For the group to act as a unit or to show organization, it is necessary that individual members speak for it. The necessity for an ordering of discussion is readily apparent as a means to a group. Such ordering must come through the action of an individual. Someone must verbalize the necessity for order, the methods of ordering, the final agreement on methods, and the agent. Some individual must order and in doing so he provides simple but necessary means for the group. Even

at this very simple level, the necessity for a leader is real and apparent to most groups. To the extent that the objectives of the group require greater diversity of effort and greater coordination, the need for a leader will increase.

Now let us look at the leader and ask some questions about his behavior. Let us again answer the questions in terms of our frame of reference and examine the answers for the sense they make.

How is the leader to be characterized?

The leader is not a disembodied entity endowed with unique characteristics. He is the leader of a group and is the leader only in terms of his functional relationship to the group. Therefore the part he plays in the total dynamic pattern of the behavior of the group defines him as leader. He is a leader not because he is intelligent, skillful or original, but because his intelligence, skill or originality is seen as a means by the group members. He is a leader not because he is relatively imposing of stature, well-dressed, fluent of speech, or from a higher socioeconomic background, but because these factors tend to predispose group members to expect better means from their possessor.

The leader is followed because he promises to get or actually gets his followers more nearly what they want than anyone else. If he does so, he will be followed be he small, insignificant looking and relatively speechless. In our culture we have some predisposition to expect people with certain characteristics to provide better means. Also certain characteristics such as intelligence may by and large in fact enable certain individuals to provide better means. However, the leader is a product not of his characteristics, but of his functional relationship to specific individuals in a specific situation. As a result, the variability of leaders' characteristics upsets all but the broadest statistical efforts at analysis.

How does the leader arise?

The leader appears to arise in one of two ways. First, as a result of agreement among members of a group that some individual serves as a better means than any other. Such agreement may be wholly predictive, a matter of guesswork, or may be the result of experience among various members. The agreement of the members of a group may be verbalized or tacit. The member of a group who suggests "Let's go get

a cup of coffee" may collect a following and for a minute or so be a leader simply because he has voiced at an instant an operation which appears as a means to other members. The member of a group who is known to possess some special skill which is at the moment a necessity may be turned to and be expected to function as a leader because of his possession. In our culture it is not unusual for any group to make it first a business to choose a leader.

The second way in which a leader may arise is as a result of objectives which require a group of people for their achievement. An individual, for example, wants to accomplish something which can only be accomplished if he can direct the activities of a number of other people. He seeks then to find a group, or an assortment of individuals, who will accept his direction of their activities. If our basic assumptions above are correct, he will acquire "followers" only if, *in their eyes,* following him promises to result in increased need satisfaction (or in avoidance of reduction of need satisfaction).

Why does the leader lead?

Through leading, the leader obtains means of satisfying his needs. Perhaps he finds satisfaction in the operation of leading, in manipulating people or in helping them. Perhaps the prestige and recognition accorded the leader are important sources of satisfaction. Or, to take the most obvious aspect, perhaps the result of the activities he directs is itself the means he seeks.

Consider, for example, the industrial manager. He may obtain satisfaction from his leadership role in a variety of ways. He may obtain satisfaction simply from being "the boss," from being able to tell people what to do, to control their activities and their satisfactions. He may find satisfaction in being regarded as their benefactor, in their gratitude for his favors, or their fear of his punishments. He may enjoy the way he is treated by those outside the organization who are impressed with his title and position. Finally, he may obtain a higher salary, promotion, and recognition from the achievements of the group whose activities he directs.

The motivation of the individual certainly plays a part in the likelihood of his leading. Many adults seem to dislike to lead. Others lead occasionally when, by reason of some special skill or knowledge they

possess, it seems to them or to the group reasonable that they should do so. Some lead only when through the concerted activities of a group of people they can find a means to some need satisfaction. Still others enjoy leading. The actual operation of leading is a means to need satisfaction for them. Such individuals are apt to seek situations in which whatever means they have will be in demand. They attempt to acquire the skills which will be means, and a manner which will indicate their possession of means. If there are "born leaders," they arise from this group. Due to the many objectives in our culture which can only be achieved through group effort, many organizations arise. A great many people find leading—that is the job of a superior in an organization—to be the means through which they satisfy important needs.

What is the function of the leader?

The function of the leader is to organize the activities of the members of the group toward the accomplishment of some and through controlling means for the satisfaction of the relevant needs of the members of the group. When the leader has been chosen by a group of people who have decided upon an objective to be attained, the leader's function is obvious and his job is relatively simple. When the leader, however, is not chosen by the group, but appointed and given means control by someone outside the group, or appoints himself because he requires a group to achieve his purposes (as in business or military organizations), his job is considerably more difficult. In such circumstances the objective to be attained through the activities of the group is the objective of those who appointed him leader. This may not be the objective of the group he is to lead. Nevertheless, he must appear to the people he is to lead as a means for *their* need satisfaction or they will not accept his direction.

Sometimes, as a consequence, the appointed leader is an individual who would never have been chosen by the group he leads, but one who cannot be rejected because he controls important means for need satisfaction. He is "accepted" as the lesser evil. He appears to the group as a means only in the negative sense. Nevertheless, even in such extreme cases, the leadership function remains the same.

Can all of the various kinds of leaders be accounted for by this same frame of reference?

The term "leader" is certainly used to designate many different positions and functions. It may be used to indicate a figurehead, a position in an organization, a self-appointed dictator possessed of sufficient "or else" power to force a following, or an individual who has been designated as leader by voluntary action of the group. To cut through the diverse usage which has been made of the term "leader," we might say that to the extent that any individual succeeds in collecting an actual following, he does so because he controls means. The dictator may be followed because he has created or made use of a situation in which all alternatives to following him are less desirable as means. The superior in the formal organization, for instance in industry, may often occupy a position similar to that of dictator without being particularly aware of it. The man who can control means available to other people can use his control to force that alternative behavior which appears a better means within the restricted choice although a worse one within a larger but forbidden frame of reference. To the extent that the means controlled are scarce means, to that extent the possibility of limiting alternatives as a means of control is possible. The leader chosen by voluntary action of a group is seen as the best means rather than the lesser evil. But all leaders, whatever their personal objectives, must serve as means for their followers, or they will not be leaders (i.e., they will have no followers).

Our conclusions from the above discussion of the nature of leadership may be summarized as follows:

1. The symbolic or romantic conception of the Leader, although widely prevalent, does not explain the phenomena of leadership. It exists, I have suggested, as a consequence of the nature of the individual's relationship with his father in early childhood. It represents a magical, perhaps wishful, attempt to find security through surrogate relationships resembling that early one. The leader, realistically and factually, is not a person endowed with a list of characteristics which make him what he is.

2. When conceived in terms of the dynamics of human social behavior, leadership is a function of needs existing in a given situation, and consists of a relationship between an individual and a group.

3. The functional relationship which is leadership exists when a

leader is perceived by a group as controlling means for the satisfaction of their needs. Following him may be seen either as a means to increased need satisfaction or as a means to prevent decreased need satisfaction.

4. The leader may "emerge" as a means to the achievement of objectives desired by a group. He may be selected, elected, or spontaneously accepted by the group because he possesses or controls means (skill, knowledge, money, associations, property, etc.) which the group desires to utilize to attain their objectives—to obtain increased need satisfaction.

5. On the other hand, the leader may appoint himself or be appointed by someone outside the group to be led. In this instance leadership is a means to the achievement of the leader's objectives (or the objectives of those who appoint him). However, there will be no relationship with the group—no followers—except in terms of the leader's control of means for the satisfaction of the needs of the followers. Either the leader's objectives must also be those of the group (and he himself be seen by the group as a means to their attainment), or else accepting the leader's direction must be seen by the group members as the best available means to prevent reduced need satisfaction.[10]

It is likely that leadership is a result of a combination of factors in group life in which the personal qualities of a leader are only part of the reason for his being made a leader. In fluid group organization, leadership emerges from the group and authority as leader is granted by the group not seized from it nor imposed upon it. It is also likely that leaders are made rather than born and that while personal endowment plays a part in the emergence of a leader from the group, the leader is made by circumstances which permit his particular talents to become important to the group.

Though the function of a leader may be defined in terms of the group goals and the group efforts toward those goals, it may be supposed that his success as leader depends upon performing for

[10] Irving Knickerbocker, "Leadership: A Conception and Some Implications," *Human Factors in Management,* rev. ed., Schuyler Dean Hoslett (editor), Harper & Brothers, New York, 1951, pp. 9–14.

the group as an idea man, creating and visioning, and as an efficiency engineer helping the group to achieve its ends with the least delay and effort. His leadership is a process in group living and has its meaning only in terms of group organization and function.

REFERENCES

ADORNO, T. W., FRENKEL-BRUNSWICK, ELSE, LEVINSON, DANIEL J., and SANFORD, R. NEVITT, *The Authoritarian Personality,* Harper & Brothers, New York, 1950.

APPLEBY, PAUL H., *Big Democracy,* Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., New York, 1945, chap. 4.

APPLEBY, PAUL H., *Policy and Administration,* University of Alabama Press, University, Alabama, 1949, chap. 5.

BARNARD, CHESTER I., *The Functions of the Executive,* Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1948, chaps. 15, 16, 17.

BARNARD, CHESTER I., *Organization and Management,* Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1948, chaps. 2, 4, 8.

BENNE, KENNETH D., and MUNTYAN, BOZIDAR, *Human Relations in Curriculum Change,* The Dryden Press, New York, 1951.

BERRIEN, F. K., *Comments and Cases on Human Relations,* Harper & Brothers, New York, 1951, chap. 8.

BOGARDUS, EMORY S., *Sociology,* 3d ed., The Macmillan Company, New York, 1949, chap. 14.

BRITT, STEWART H., *Social Psychology of Modern Life,* revised, Rinehart & Company, Inc., New York, 1949, chap. 14.

CARTWRIGHT, DORWIN, and ZANDER, ALVIN, *Group Dynamics,* Row, Peterson and Company, Evanston, Illinois, 1953, part VI.

CLEETON, GLEN U., and MASON, CHARLES W., *Executive Ability, Its Discovery and Development,* The Antioch Press, Yellow Springs, Ohio, 1946, chaps. 1, 3, 8, 17.

DAVIS, RALPH C., *The Fundamentals of Top Management,* Harper & Brothers, New York, 1951, chap. 5.

DIMOCK, MARSHALL E., *The Executive in Action,* Harper & Brothers, New York, 1945.

DUBIN, ROBERT, *Human Relations in Administration,* Prentice-Hall, Inc., New York, 1951, chaps. 1, 7, 14.

FAYOL, HENRI, *General and Industrial Management,* Sir Isaac Pitman & Sons, Ltd., London, 1949, chap. 5.

GARDNER, BURLEIGH B., and MOORE, DAVID G., *Human Relations in Industry,* rev. ed., Richard D. Irwin, Inc., Chicago, 1950, chaps. 19, 20.

GLOVER, JOHN D., and HOWER, RALPH M., *The Administrator, Cases on Human Relations in Business,* Richard D. Irwin, Inc., Chicago, 1949.

GOLDEN, CLINTON S., and RUTTENBERG, HAROLD J., *The Dynamics of Industrial Democracy,* Harper & Brothers, New York, 1942, chap. 3.

GORDON, ROBERT AARON, *Business Leadership in the Large Corporation,* The Brookings Institution, Washington, 1945, chaps. 1, 3.

GOULDNER, ALVIN W. (editor), *Studies in Leadership,* Harper & Brothers, New York, 1950.

GULICK, LUTHER, and URWICK, L. (editors), *Papers on the Science of Administration,* Institute of Public Administration, New York, 1937, chaps. 1, 3.

HEMPEL, EDWARD H. (editor), *Small Plant Management,* McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., New York, 1950, chap. 5.

HOSLETT, SCHUYLER DEAN, *Human Factors in Management,* rev. ed., Harper & Brothers, New York, 1951, parts I, III.

INTERNATIONAL CITY MANAGERS' ASSOCIATION, *The Technique of Municipal Administration,* 3rd ed., The International City Managers' Association, Chicago, 1947, chaps. 1, 4.

KRECH, DAVID, and CRUTCHFIELD, RICHARD, *Theory and Problems of Social Psychology,* McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., New York, 1948, chap. 11.

LEIGHTON, ALEXANDER H., *The Governing of Men,* Princeton University Press, Princeton, New Jersey, 1946, part II.

LEWISOHN, SAM A., *Human Leadership in Industry,* Harper & Brothers, New York, 1945, chaps. 4, 6.

LIVINGSTON, ROBERT T., *The Engineering of Organization and Management,* McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., New York, 1949, chaps. 13, 14.

MACIVER, R. M., *Society, A Textbook of Sociology,* Rinehart & Company, Inc., New York, 1937, book II.

MARX, FRITZ MORSTEIN (editor), *Elements of Public Administration,* Prentice-Hall, Inc., New York, 1946, chap. 8.

MOONEY, JAMES D., *The Principles of Organization,* rev. ed., Harper & Brothers, New York, 1947, chap. 3.

NEWCOMB, THEODORE M., *Social Psychology,* The Dryden Press, New York, 1950, chaps. 6, 7.

NEWMAN, WILLIAM, *Administrative Action,* Prentice-Hall, Inc., New York, 1951, chaps. 18, 19, 20.

ROETHLISBERGER, F. J., *Management and Morale,* Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1950, chap. 3.

SARGENT, S. STANSFELD, *Social Psychology, An Integrative Interpretation,* The Ronald Press Company, New York, 1950, chap. 12.

SEARS, JESSE, *The Nature of the Administrative Process,* McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., New York, 1950, chap. 3.

SELEKMAN, BENJAMIN M., *Labor Relations and Human Relations,* McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1947, chaps. 7, 8.

TAYLOR, GORDON R., *Are Workers Human?* Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston, 1952, chap. 10.

TEAD, ORDWAY, *The Art of Administration,* McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., New York, 1951.

TRECKER, HARLEIGH, *Group Process in Administration,* The Woman's Press, New York, 1946.

URWICK, L., *The Elements of Administration,* Harper & Brothers, New York, 1943, chap. 6.

VILLALON, LUIS J. A. (editor), *Management Men and Their Methods,* Funk & Wagnalls Co., New York, 1949, chaps. 1, 2, 4.

WALDO, DWIGHT, *The Administrative State,* The Ronald Press Company, New York, 1948, chap. 6.

WHITE, LEONARD, *Introduction to the Study of Public Administration,* 3d ed., The Macmillan Company, New York, 1948, chap. 13.

CHAPTER III

The Factor of Purpose in Administration

Can the formulation of purpose be a group activity or must formulation be an individual activity with consideration and acceptance by the group?

In a business or other enterprise must remote although admittedly important objectives be set aside while near and "practical" objectives are given attention?

Do purposes grow out of felt needs or do purposes cause the needs to be felt?

Are social or group goals something other than a combination of individual goals? Are individual goals set aside or abandoned in group action toward group-accepted goals?

Does the leader of a group, an administrator of an enterprise, or other person in temporary or continuing leadership lead members of the organization to accept his purposes as theirs, or does he formulate and strengthen purposes which he senses are being held already by group members?

Can there be a group purpose which all group members accept individually as stimulus and guide to personal activity?

I

The question every hour for the school administrator must be: "Where am I going?" *not* "What am I doing?" In like vein, the question for public education as a whole must be one of direction

first, for without worthy objectives an activity can be worthy only by happenstance. This is true regardless of the terms in which evaluation is made.

The soul of an activity is its purpose. Its meaning is in its purpose. The life of an activity, its creation as well as its creativity, is in the purpose which animates and continues it. Direction, movement, development, and consummation are in terms of purpose as must be evaluation also.

Purpose creates the effort employed toward the accomplishment of an accepted goal and dictates the activity to be initiated. Of course, the accomplishment is not necessarily complete or even partial. The activity initiated may be turned toward other objects or abandoned as other activities are brought into being or as the effort ends in frustration. To the administrator engaged in the tasks of his position, the concern is first the purpose to be served in each situation and then the activity initiated because of the purpose.

His tasks would be made much lighter if in each situation there was but one purpose to be served and but one activity to be initiated at a time. But most situations are complex rather than simple and several purposes and resultant activities may be factors in a given situation. Some operation at "cross-purposes" may be expected in most situations. Not all activities carried on concurrently and ostensibly toward a common end will support accomplishment of that end. Ideally, every activity of a school should be a step in the direction of accomplishing the great objectives of education. Practically, while most activities of the school should stand well against such a requirement, some compromise will be necessary although the administrator cannot thereby evade the acceptance of responsibility for the directing of the whole effort of the school toward these great objectives. For instance, while the overcrowding of the school plant may be a present necessity, the administrator undertaking to develop a workable compromise between the desirable and the necessary must make his judgments in terms of how best under the circumstances to assure progress toward the objectives

which are the justification of the school activity. The expedient does not remove the requirement of loyalty to the principle.

In the busyness of routine in school administration, the administrator may lose the sense of sure accomplishment in the direction of the large goals of public education. There may come to him uncertainty and a growing feeling of frustration as the "chores" of administration seize upon his time and command the larger part of his efforts. The great purposes of education in a free society may seem remote and unattainable, the preoccupations of theorists and not of practical men.

But as the distant point in view becomes the objective of the cross-fields walker and directs his every step so that his way is straight and sure, so the idealized objectives of education as a whole direct the separate and sometimes small activities of the schools in a step-by-step progression toward the great goals recognized in the distance. The lesser activities of the school administrator find their place in the whole effort of public education to accomplish that which is held to be its important objectives.

Activities so directed attain dignity and importance as they flow into the large stream of activities in education, and with that stream into the larger stream of activities of a dynamic society moving toward its great objectives. The ends of school administration in America are to be found in the direction of the ends of education, and those ends in turn in the direction of the ends of society as Western civilization has come to conceive them.

School administration in and of itself has no value. It acquires value as it performs a *service* function to the educational undertaking. The separate activities of administration, which sometimes of themselves seem to loom so large in the administrator's working day, are of worth only as they share in the performance of this service function. There is then evident a hierarchy of purposes and activities with lesser purposes animating administrative activities in the service of somewhat larger purposes, which in turn animate the greater activities in the service of still larger purposes. No pur-

pose is mean or an activity unworthy of attention if it contributes toward the accomplishment of objectives of first importance. But when schedules and budgets and administrative busywork become ends in themselves, the administrator has lost his way, and as a pilot of the educational ship he is sailing without taking his bearings.

It would be false, of course, to suppose that purposes can exist apart from individual persons. The purpose of education will be viewed "as he sees it" by each individual and the purposes of administration will be as the administrator sees them. Purposes are of persons individually. Purposes of education listed by groups become purposes only as they animate persons singly and in groups in the service of those stated purposes. Otherwise such lists are useful only in suggesting a commonalty of opinion and in stimulating individuals toward development of purposes in kind. The development of purpose may be stimulated by external influences but the coming into being of purpose is a unique happening within the individual and no two persons could entertain the *same* purpose however *similar* the purposes of the two persons might be. A statement of educational philosophy by a school staff is indicative more of some commonness of belief rather than the actual philosophy of any person in the group. Each person in a group acts because of "self-purposes" though a "group purpose" may seem to be served. Only when commonness of direction exists in a particular situation or when different purposes do not bring about strongly opposed activities do individuals work well together in groups.

The difficulty is more a theoretical than actual one for if the purposes of individuals in a society were not more alike than unlike, social organization would be impossible. The forces of social approval and disapproval, the traditions and contemporary acceptances of the social groups of which he is a part, shape the developing purposes of the individual, and condition his responses in the social situation so that he finds his purposes and activities much like those of his fellows.

But should the school administrator be passive in acceptance and uncritical of his own philosophical development and conditioning, he may find himself expressing his "beliefs" about education and about administration in easy catch-phrases and borrowed lists of so-called purposes or objectives. His true purposes with their resultant activities may well be hidden even from himself and his work as administrator be performed without vision or conscious direction. Where educational statesmanship is needed, he may bring only the equipment of the manager and expediter rather than that of the educational leader.

II

The administrator cannot rest content that the proper purposes for his organization to serve will arise necessarily out of the experience of the organization or the collective effort of personnel. As leader, he should initiate group effort toward first, the identification of purposes which might be served and second, the selection of purposes toward which organizational action will be taken. Some purposes are recognized as proper and important upon being named. They may be general or specific and may be of a nature to stimulate immediate effort toward their attainment, or they may be such that, while recognizably important, they cannot be served within the scope of the organization. As proper purposes of education, they may be considered to exist whether or not the organization acts upon them, provided that they are accepted as purposes for the *field* of education if not for a particular school organization. A general statement of the task of education such as *Education should develop good citizens* may be accepted by teachers of a particular school as an expression of a proper end of education, but it may not become one of the ends which that school will serve directly until it has been translated into components which can be accomplished by action within the local situation. But both large generalized purposes which may not stir group action and smaller, more specific purposes which will cause local action are important.

The generalized purposes of education perhaps need only to be recognized in order to be accepted by the group of persons with which the administrator is working. Such purposes may be accepted by everyone in the group without reservation and perhaps without much consideration. They may be enunciated by speakers addressing teachers' meetings and expressed over and over again in professional literature of education. The danger is that they may be accepted without an accompanying sense of responsibility for their service. For example, it is not uncommon to find expressed the sentiment that a proper end of education is the full development of every child in terms of his potential. Whenever enunciated, the accompaniment is almost certain to be a general nodding of heads in agreement although few persons in an audience of teachers may have a real understanding of what such a purpose requires in terms of school practices and program. The result is that teachers accept as a purpose of education a statement which does not lead to their purposing to do anything in their own work toward accomplishment of the stated end, although it can be accomplished only by teachers at work in their classrooms. While the principle offered in the statement is a vital one in public education, its enunciation is a resounding emptiness. The generalized purposes are needed to give integration and meaning to the more specific objectives which the school may seek. To obviate the difficulty of important generalized statements being accepted without thought and without effect upon practice, it is desirable to follow each such declaration with inquiries as to what accomplishment of each stated end requires in the local situation. That refinement of a generalized statement of purpose is the obligation of the school administrator as educational leader.

With refinement of generalized purpose comes examination of means at hand to accomplish the purpose in part or wholly to the intensity permitted. If the teachers recognize that the purpose should be served but that in the local situation means are not available to achieve the purpose satisfactorily, the purpose—even when

the compulsions upon local school practices are recognized—loses its power to stimulate action on the part of the group. The administrator as leader needs to bring the group to acceptance of the purpose and then to a decision as to what can be done in the service of it in the light of presently and prospectively available means and abilities. It is likely that any accepted purpose can be served in some manner and to some degree in any school situation.

While generalized purposes may be accepted with little debate by a group, specific purposes including those which are formed as components of generalized purposes often occasion much discussion and their proposal may be rejected. Group leadership at this point is called upon, first, to establish that an immediate purpose serves a larger and more generalized purpose which has recognition by the group; second, to establish that the proposed immediate purpose can be accomplished by the group if it acts upon it; third, to establish that the immediate objective is in terms of the local situation the one which should be given priority in the group's activity; fourth, to establish the proposed organization objective as a personal objective of those persons who must be depended upon to work toward the objective; and fifth, to initiate some activity toward the objective so that the group's will to exert effort in the interest of accomplishment will not be weakened by delay.

Though the factor of purpose has not been widely treated in administrative study, some of the observations of students in other fields than school administration can be helpful to the school administrator. Simon writes of the organization objective in a factory.

> In an organization, there appears, in addition to the personal aims of the participants, an organization objective, or objectives. If the organization is a shoe factory, for example, it assumes the objective of making shoes. Whose objective is this—the entrepreneur's, the customers', or the employees'? To deny that it belongs to any of these would seem to posit some "group mind," some organismic entity which is over and above its human components. The true explanation is simpler: the organization objective is, indirectly, a personal objective of all the par-

ticipants. It is the means whereby their organizational activity is bound together to achieve a satisfaction of their own diverse personal motives. It is by employing workers to make shoes and by selling them that the entrepreneur makes his profit; it is by accepting the direction of the entrepreneur in the making of shoes that the employee earns his wage; and it is by buying the finished shoes that the customer obtains his satisfaction from the organization. Since the entrepreneur wishes a profit, and since he controls the behavior of the employees (within their respective areas of acceptance), it behooves him to guide the behavior of the employees by the criterion of "making shoes as efficiently as possible." In so far, then, as he can control behavior in the organization, he establishes this as the objective of the behavior.[1]

The intensity of a purpose adopted as a group objective varies from one individual to another in the group and probably varies with respect to the degree of participation of the individual in adopting the purpose as an object for the group and for him as a group member. But in any organization of size too great for all members to participate fully in all discussions leading to the setting up of objectives, many persons must be called upon to serve the purpose without their having had opportunity to examine fully the premises upon which the purpose was selected or to develop their own purposes in harmony with the established group purpose. In some cases, the primary purpose must be served through the accomplishment of secondary objectives in the achievement of which there is not the satisfaction which might attend the achievement of the primary end of the group action. This means that the enthusiasm of individual group members may flag or, for that matter, never be aroused though their contributions to the achievement of secondary ends be of utmost importance to the achieving of the main goal of group effort.

Since school systems are ongoing social institutions with, for the most part, individual histories reaching back a century or so in this

[1] Herbert A. Simon, *Administrative Behavior,* The Macmillan Company, New York, 1947, pp. 17–18.

country and few major organizational changes through decades of operation, they may be subject to activity projected by tradition and habit rather than by consideration of basic institutional purposes. It is likely that some school systems might profitably inquire about particular activities in the school as Urwick suggests the industrial consultant might inquire about particular jobs being performed in a business enterprise.

> The organization should only exist in order to carry out some specific purpose implicit in the forecast and the plan. Every piece of it should make a definite and authorized contribution to that purpose. Otherwise there is no reason for its existence.
>
> It is important to remember this, especially in examining an organization already set up. Once an enterprise is in being jobs are created. That is to say, individuals secure emoluments and rank and other advantages from the existence of that piece of the organization. The whole momentum of their customary habits of work, both individual and collective, is added to these arguments for keeping that particular part of the organization in action. In short, quite apart from the objectives of the undertaking considered as an entity, all kinds of personal and group incentives come into being internally, all directed positively towards maintaining the *status quo.*
>
> It cannot be too strongly emphasised that these motives may have nothing whatever to do with the objectives of the organization as such. They constitute a completely separate series of considerations which, if they run counter to the true objectives of the undertaking, should be eliminated or disregarded. To do so demands both vigilance and courage. Which is why little sections are found so commonly in every type of undertaking busily engaged in quite useless tasks—compiling regular statistics, for instance, to answer a question which was asked once five or ten years ago and has never been repeated since. The first questions which every Consultant asks himself in face of every job are: "What does this piece of work contribute towards the main objectives of this undertaking?" "Is it really necessary?"[2]

[2] L. Urwick, *The Elements of Administration,* Harper & Brothers, New York, 1943, pp. 42–44.

What may be called the purposing process in an organization is a concern of the responsible leader. The importance of the school administrator's attending to the development of purposes for the guidance and stimulation of his organization cannot be overestimated. The parallel necessity in a business organization may be studied with some profit because, with all due recognition to the complexity of some large modern business enterprises, the purposing process is carried on with fewer and more highly controlled factors than in a multifaceted social agency such as a large school system.

One of the principal purposes in freeing executives of detail is to permit them to concentrate major attention on performance of the company as a whole. This function involves the co-ordination of all parts of the organization, and direction of their activities toward attainment of the over-all results desired. As in the case of the individual control procedures, the first step must be the determination of the task to be done—the planning of objectives.

First, there is the broad general objective for the company as a whole. It is in terms of this objective that the general effectiveness of the organization is measured. It is usually established by the board of directors, through approval of the objective proposed either by general management or originated by the board itself. Such an objective is ordinarily expressed in terms of profit for the year, based on a certain volume at an estimated cost and selling price. It is usually stated by months or quarters, in order to provide a basis for progressive following of results. There may also be other auxiliary objectives, such as a decrease in the accident rate, or improvement in the cash position. Actual accomplishment compared with these objectives is the measure of over-all performance.

The establishment of the objective is an important consideration. Since the organization is to be held for its accomplishment, it must be reasonably attainable. All conditions having a bearing on the outcome, such as the sales outlook, forecast of general business conditions, cost trends, labor conditions, and industry developments must be taken into consideration. The test of the objective is to determine what the accom-

plishment has been in the past; what the present rate is; what accomplishment is desired; and then to judge whether the desired improvement is reasonable to expect.

In some companies a single, dominant individual sets the objectives and looks to general management to meet them. He stands by, criticizing, suggesting, investigating, approving, and driving to obtain the results desired. In other companies the objectives for the year are worked out within the organization, reviewed by general management, and passed to the board as a commitment for the organization. The board examines the general objective, determines whether it is satisfactory, calls for any adjustments thought necessary, and finally accepts it as the goal for the organization.

It is not enough to establish the general objective. As a matter of fact, that concerns mostly the first and second zones of management. To be really successful the co-operation of every person in the organization is needed. The general objective must therefore be translated into terms of each and every department. For example, the sales department's objective may be to sell a given volume at a price, and with a certain expense; that of the manufacturing department may be to produce the quantity and quality desired, at a given time and cost. These departmental objectives may in turn be broken down to divisions, locations, and individuals. The final test is to have every single person with his own particular objective, all being co-ordinated to produce successive cumulative results leading to the general objective for the company as a whole.

As a practical matter, the preplanning of objectives must necessarily include the changes, the costs, and all other factors involved in attaining them. The result must be matched and weighed against the costs of attainment in order to judge its merit. A complete and comprehensive plan is therefore the very essence of establishing objectives. Such a plan likewise provides the gauge against which to measure performance.

This process is not one of accounting analysis whereby probable expenses are matched against those of last year. It is a well-rounded plan. It is the responsibility of the executives in charge to consider all improvements to be made during the year and preplan the action which will bring them about. Aside from affording a preview of annual results from a dollar-and-cents standpoint, it permits shaping action in

advance to meet impending situations instead of meeting them unprepared on short notice.[3]

Livingston describes the policy-establishing step in organizational purposing.

The translation of an objective into concrete, definite, comprehensible, and understood terms and the explanation of how the group is expected to attain this objective comprise policy. Such a statement of purpose in definite and understandable terms is a prerequisite for the accomplishment of any objective. Policy clarifies specifically the human means to be used to attain the goal. It is a translation of the general plan of top management into concrete form.

In any association where it is necessary to use judgment (and at every level some judgment is required), it is important that the person who is called upon to exercise judgment should know what the real objectives are and where the association is attempting to go. Only if such knowledge is generally held can the best course of winning the goal be laid out. It is particularly important when all does not go according to precedent. Modifications and alterations can be made as requisite from time to time in the face of unexpected or even adverse circumstances, as long as every level of the organization is familiar with policy. Policy is a body of principles and rules of action that serves as a directive, guiding the organization in the achievement of its objectives with proper regard for ideals. Upon this consideration it may be said that policy is a statement of the background of limitations.

There may be conflict as to method of attaining the objective. The method pursued is as important as the end. That it shapes the objective is a fact not always understood. The means are not independent of the end, they determine it. What may start as a noble ideal becomes ignoble if unworthy means are used to follow it.

A policy must be foresighted enough to envisage the results of its decisions. The proof of a policy is the performance. Every policy should be based on a philosophy. It is essential that policy be interpreted at every level where there is a transfer of authority. This is the trustee

[3] By permission from *Top-Management Organization and Control,* by Paul E. Holden, Lounsbury S. Fish, and Hubert L. Smith. Copyright, 1951. McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc. Pp. 203–204.

concept. At every transfer the superior authority is a trustee for the authority that has been granted. He must interpret for the lower level. Obviously, as we descend the ladder, the question of policy interpretation becomes increasingly specific.

Statement of goal is particularly important where many people or units are combined. A single person may not have to tell himself what his goal is, although it is often useful, but where there are several people, or several groups of different functions and scalar levels, it is of great importance. No organization can foresee every possible circumstance. There will be choices facing the various functionaries. Unless they know the goal, they are incapable of using their judgment, and the real goal may be missed in the pursuit of a stated procedure or policy. Goals are seldom directly realizable; therefore, the real goals should be clarified and stated definitely so that indirection can be used where necessary. Having once been stated, a policy needs interpretation at every point of transfer of authority and responsibility. One of the principal duties at each level in the chain of authority is the interpretation of policy to the level below. Out of policy come procedures, which are the routines for the personnel and the processes.[4]

Closer to the work of the school administrator in policy-making is that of other public administrators. Leiserson discusses the formulation of administrative policy as a part of the purposing process of government.

The primary organ of policy sanction is the legislature. In the main, it lays down policy in general terms. For purposes of effective government such general policy, usually expressed in statutes, must be made more specific. This is done by administrative policy-formulation as an implementation of statutory directions addressed to the executive branch.

Policy in the latter sense may consist of the determination of a long-range work program, such as the number of applications to be processed, surplus items to be sold, inspections to be made, projects to be

[4] By permission from *The Engineering of Organization and Management* by Robert T. Livingston. Copyright, 1949. McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc. Pp. 127–128.

completed, during a given time period. It may mean establishing a criterion or standard for the guidance of staff thinking in making decisions on recurrent matters in the course of day-to-day operations. Or it may mean a highly specific decision—for instance, whether a precedent-setting letter should be sent out or an important appointment made. In the broadest sense, however, a policy question is one which requires an authoritative determination as to whether or not a new program or change in an existing plan of action should be undertaken.

The distinction between legislative and administrative policy does not turn so much upon an inherent difference in the content of policy as upon the extent to which the proposed innovation or plan of action involves a fundamental change in existing public policy. The new program or policy will require legislative authorization primarily as it calls for amendment or revision of established practices or expectancies around which public feelings or economic interests have become consolidated. No satisfactory substitute has been found for the educational value of public discussion created by open investigation and debate, the safeguards implicit in public hearings, and the stability gained by survival of the legislative crucible and the embodiment of policy in the form of law. The great hazards in the legislative process are the distorting influences of partisan forces seeking narrow objectives through piecemeal amendment, regardless—and sometimes at the price—of the over-all plan.

It is often claimed that the chief executive is in a better position than the lawmaking body to secure expert consideration of policy questions in the light of the complexities and conflicts that have to be reconciled. However, he has his own problems of maintaining personal relationships with the leaders of his party in the legislature, appraising the popularity of policy proposals in terms of votes, and ensuring cohesion of his party organization. Given the multiplicity of policy initiators in the legislature, it is clear nevertheless that he has an important and legitimate function on behalf of the whole people to state authoritatively his opinion on the substance of proposed policy. He is best placed to answer the question of how far policy should be formulated on the basis of considerations deemed important by the experts in getting votes—the politicians—and how much weight should be given the fac-

tors deemed important by the experts in getting the job done—the administrators.

Put in another way, our constitutional system assumes the desirability of divided responsibility and rivalry between chief executive and legislature. As a consequence, the chief executive bears a large part of the burden of formulating and explaining the need for changed public policies and for focusing the legislators' attention upon the issues which they should decide, as distinct from those decisions which should be left to administrative judgment and competence.[5]

III

The school administrator as leader of an organization and responsible officer in its operation needs to be aware at all times of what the organization is doing. But if he is to determine what is being accomplished, he will need to have a clear perception of the purposes of the school, the specific objectives which have animated its activity, and the degree to which the purposes are being served and the objectives achieved. While the administrator needs a clear definition of purposes, personal and organizational, so that he may function well as leader of a group of professional and nonprofessional workers, the *members* of the group must also individually hold purposes in keeping with the ends for which the organization was created and in keeping with the nature of the services which those individuals perform within the organization. To secure the commonalty of purpose which is important to the organization's operation in the interest for which it exists, purposing must be widespread in the group or groups which are called upon to work together. Though the administrator leader must often formulate statements of purpose, his acceptance of the stated purposes does not make them the ends of the organization, and he must bring into the process of identification, formulation, and adoption of purpose those upon whom the organization must depend for the

[5] Avery Leiserson, "The Formulation of Administrative Policy," *Elements of Public Administration,* Fritz Morstein Marx (editor), Prentice-Hall, Inc., New York, 1946, pp. 365–368.

accomplishment desired. This is merely uncommon good sense on the part of the administrator, for as individuals participate in the developing of purposes toward which they are expected to act they make the purposes their own and find their success or failure in terms of the purposes. The animation of individuals toward specific ends comes about as the ends are *personalized* even while being also organizational objectives.

In the establishing of purposes by which activity of the organization may be guided, the school administrator has as a useful opening question by which the members of the group he leads may begin the development of a structure of purposes the inquiry: *What are the large purposes of education in our modern society?* Though the question may seem remote from the immediate concerns of a school organization and connote the theoretical rather than the practical affairs which often appear more important to groups of people, it is difficult to see how a group of teachers can fashion a program of education without working first to establish a base of commonly held beliefs about education in general. Even groups of teachers which have been maintained long as working organizations need on occasion to re-examine their "first" principles to make certain of sufficient agreement among the teachers to permit an integration of their efforts. Such re-examination also provides an opportunity to find out whether the school program may have strayed from its proper course through modifications of its features as time has passed and whether the program is in fact responding to the changing social situation in which the school with all other aspects of our civilization necessarily is part.

Attention to the question of the large purposes of education may be given in teachers' meetings where discussion may involve all of the group or a representative panel of teachers who have studied the matter thoroughly with a view to presenting their thinking to the group as a whole in one or more general teachers' meetings. Speakers from outside the school system may offer both professional and lay observations about the general purposes which

schools should serve. Administrative and supervisory bulletins may treat the matter from time to time. Reading lists developed by supervisory personnel may encourage special reading to this point by both teacher groups and individuals.

It can be recognized that not all teachers will engage in the examination of basic premises of education wholeheartedly nor will all accept the statements of purpose the group as a whole will offer as representing the essential position of the group. Finding the points of difference as well as the points of agreement can serve the desire to examine the premises upon which the school acts in the performance of its task. But while disagreement may arise over the general purposes of education, disagreement is much more likely to occur as a group of teachers tries to determine what ought to be done in the local school situation in the service of the general purposes which are recognized as significant by the group.

A second question by which the administrator as leader may stimulate the examination of purposes by the group of teachers who work with him is: *What are the particular purposes of this school or school system in its task of education?* This is to suggest that each school system and each unit in the school system has special concerns in education which are its own by virtue of geographical location, the nature of its clientele, the economic factors in the life of the community, and the pattern of social life and social change in the school environment. The assumption is that each group of teachers has an educational function unique to the group because of the local situation in which the group works, a function which must be performed by that group of teachers or not at all. The general purposes of all education become translated into the particular purposes of a particular school group, and are expressed in terms meaningful to the local situation, as teachers look at their tasks in the light of general educational purposes and the purposes which might desirably be served because of the immediate physical and social environment of the school.

From the second question grows the third: *Of the purposes*

which might be served by the school in the local situation, which ought to be accepted at this time for implementation by the school? Not all desirable tasks can be performed by the school nor should that be expected. The administrator and the other teachers may develop together a priority list with most pressing needs to be met first and the desirable but less pressing tasks postponed until such time as the school is better able to perform them. The physical plant, adequacy or inadequacy of staff or equipment, enrollment and grade-distribution factors, costs, community pressures, over-all policies, and state school law condition the acceptance of some purposes over others. Creative administration can overcome some disabilities, but it cannot overcome failure on the part of the school staff to identify and accept worthy purposes to be served by co-operative effort in the school. Leadership can suggest and promote but organizational purposes grow out of the acceptance by individuals of personal purposes in keeping with the general ends of the organization.

The policy-making part of the purposing process develops from a fourth question: *How shall the accepted purposes be served?* It may be argued that statements of purposes are valueless unless action is undertaken toward achievement. Plans of action, selection of alternative courses of procedure, adoption of expedients, development of ways and means by which accomplishment of accepted purposes may be brought about, and the making of a time-and-sequence schedule are parts of the answer to the question of how the accepted purposes may be accomplished by the organization.

A fifth question follows in the purposing process but has its roots early in the development of organizational purpose and extends through the efforts toward accomplishment. The question is one of evaluation and is twofold: *Are we doing what we should be doing in the light of our avowed purposes? How well are we doing that which we are doing?* The concern with evaluation of accomplishment and action toward accomplishment may seem to be something apart from occupation with purposing itself. Yet,

purposing is continuous with immediate objectives established and attained in the course of effort in the service of over-all objectives. Without continuous evaluation, activity may be confused in direction as it goes on and original goals lost sight of as the organization gives its energy toward accomplishment of the near and evident objectives. A feeling of success may suffuse an organization as interim objectives are achieved one after the other, although a long and careful look at the progress being made toward the more remote but primary goals would disconcert the members of the organization if they could be led to appreciate the true situation. Only by measuring progress toward attainment of the chief objectives of education can members of a school organization know whether or not the activities they are carrying on subscribe to the effort of the school to do the task for which it was set up.

Purposes, long range and short range, personal and organizational, animate the activity of an organization. The identification, formulation, acceptance, and implementation of purpose are facets of the leadership task, in which the school administrator stimulates and assists the members of the group toward achievement of the objectives of a local school and of education in general.

REFERENCES

BARNARD, CHESTER I., *The Functions of the Executive,* Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1948, chaps. 3, 7, 13.

BENNE, KENNETH D., and MUNTYAN, BOZIDAR, *Human Relations in Curriculum Change,* The Dryden Press, New York, 1951.

CLEETON, GLEN U., and MASON, CHARLES W., *Executive Ability, Its Discovery and Development,* The Antioch Press, Yellow Springs, Ohio, 1946, chap. 15.

DALE, ERNEST, *Planning and Developing the Company Organization Structure,* American Management Association, New York, 1952, chap. 1.

DAVIS, RICHARD CURRIER, *Industrial Organization and Management,* Harper & Brothers, New York, 1940, chaps. 1, 4, 6.

DEHUSZAR, GEORGE B., *Practical Applications of Democracy,* Harper & Brothers, New York, 1945, chap. 10.

DIMOCK, MARSHALL E., *The Executive in Action,* Harper & Brothers, New York, 1945, chap. 1.

FAYOL, HENRI, *General and Industrial Management,* Sir Isaac Pitman & Sons, Ltd., London, 1949, chap. 1.

GAUS, JOHN MERRIMAN, *Reflections on Public Administration,* University of Alabama Press, University, Alabama, 1947, chaps. 1, 3.

HOLDEN, PAUL E., FISH, LOUNSBERRY S., and SMITH, HUBERT L., *Top-Management Organization and Control,* McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1951, part A.

KIMBALL, DEXTER S., and KIMBALL, DEXTER S., JR., *Principles of Industrial Organization,* 5th ed., McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., New York, 1939, chap. 6.

LEPAWSKY, ALBERT, *Administration,* Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., New York, 1949, part I.

LIVINGSTON, ROBERT T., *The Engineering of Organization and Management,* McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., New York, 1949, chap. 8.

MARX, FRITZ MORSTEIN (editor), *Elements of Public Administration,* Prentice-Hall, Inc., New York, 1946, chaps. 4, 6.

SIMON, HERBERT A., *Administrative Behavior,* The Macmillan Company, New York, 1947, chap. 1.

SMITH, HAROLD D., *The Management of Your Government,* McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1945, chap. 3.

TEAD, ORDWAY, *The Art of Administration,* McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., New York, 1951, chap. 2.

URWICK, L., *The Elements of Administration,* Harper & Brothers, New York, 1943, chap. 1.

CHAPTER IV

The Factor of Organization in Administration

Where is the seat of authority in an organization?

Is there final authority in democratic organization?

Is the ready modifiability of an organization a source of strength or weakness?

If the line-and-staff concept of organization is to be superseded, what alternatives are there?

To what extent can organizing as an administrative task be delegated by the administrator?

I

Administration acts through organization. It creates, shapes, employs, and discards organizations moment by moment as effort is exerted toward the accomplishment of the ends for which organizations are brought into being. If administration brings into being ephemeral arrangements only to destroy or abandon them as the purposes for which they are created are accomplished, or as the effort toward accomplishment is discontinued in favor of other activity, that is one of the ways by which administration—public administration, that is—stays alive in the service of the social purposes to which it is dedicated.

Organizational arrangements of short life are important in the discharge of special duties temporary in nature, in the achieving of short-range objectives, in providing flexibility of operation. A need for action is perceived, a plan of operation is developed, a

temporary organization is created, the objective is attained, the organization which set up to meet the need of the hour is dissolved, and the administrator under whose leadership the organization was created and the operation carried out turns to other tasks to be accomplished by other short-term or long-term organizational arrangements.

Desirably, the organizing activity is a continuous one serving emerging purposes in an evolving situation whose aspects change moment to moment, day to day, week to week, month to month. The effectiveness of administration is most assured by the employment of today's organization toward today's needs, today's procedures toward the accomplishment of today's objectives. The persistence of organization once created results often in the hampering of operation in that the organizational arrangement retained long after its reason for being has been lost acquires a halo of essentiality as though what has been must therefore continue to be. How quickly persons within the organization find security in an organizational pattern and how reluctantly and suspiciously face the prospect of change in the familiar way of doing things. In most organizations the administrator could use pruning shears to advantage and yet the quick defense of the familiar urges caution, not haste. The administrator new to his position finds that the dead past of the organization projects into his future and that fundamental organizational changes must come slowly or not at all.

There are, then, organizations which should be ephemeral, called into being for a specific and temporary purpose. There are other organizations which are in creation and evolution a very long time and which provide the stability and continuity necessary for group life. The former are simple organizations, often little affected by precedent or established procedure. They are often spontaneous, rising to the need of the moment, and simply structured until operational experience suggests a change in the arrangement of the group or its procedures. Such simple organizations may come

into being when several motorists, strangers to each other, combine their strengths to help another traveler get his car out of a roadside ditch. If they work together at the task, an organization of sorts is created, although perhaps little thought is given by anyone as to the pattern of organization best suited to their strengths and the task which they undertake. Should the pooling of strength fail to put the car back on the road, the employment of towropes or levers or the addition of other persons as participants would bring a different, or strongly modified, organization to the task. But upon success in the undertaking, the organization would in all likelihood be dissolved never again to come into being.

Many school tasks are served by such short-lived organizational arrangements. The difference is that in the continued proximity of the participants to each other the memory of the organization of the moment may persist and the arrangement found suitable for getting one car out of the ditch may come to be held suitable for removing all educational cars in the ditch. To the reluctantly creative, once is a precedent and twice, confirmation. Plaguing every administrator is the declaration, "Last year we did it this way."

But adaptation of the school to changing demands upon it is not to be secured through a series of organized efforts each implementing a pattern created, employed, and discarded without reference to what went on before and to what might be expected to come after. Simple organizational arrangements should serve simple needs and short-range purposes. But no social organizations, even of the simplest kind, stand alone. Human association is complex even within small groups. And what we are choosing to call *organization* is really organization within organization, wheels within wheels, and with no part quite independent of any other part of whatever complex is being observed. The temporariness of some arrangements of group action is possible because larger arrangements within still larger arrangements provide the continuity which is necessary to social stability through changing situations. Social stability is impossible if expected to be carried by organiza-

tions of the moment. Organization through time carries the promise of *conservation* along with the threat of *obsolescence.* The administrative task is the securing of one and the averting of the other. Continuous evaluation, continuous experimentation, continuous *re*organization, and careful distinction between the desirably temporary and the desirably longer-lasting are important to the administrator as organizer. The organization which is created and re-created in terms of structure and group may persist in honored service for a long time, provided that it affords flexibility in operation and provided that modifiability characterizes its pattern.

We have used the term *organization* loosely to designate a pattern on the one hand and operation or patterned behavior on the other. To some, the organization is a structure, an arrangement devoid of life in itself as a newly dug canal system might lie dead until water is sent coursing along the channels. To others, organization is people—a positioning of individuals through whom will flow energy when the organization is put to work. To still others, organization is the flowing together of effort as a river is a *flowing* not simply bed, bank, water, and mere motion. All concepts have their significance and in *organizing* all must be attended to if persons, places, things are to be placed in such relationship that effort expended will flow through time toward the accomplishment of the purpose for which the organization was created. People are organized in any relationship developed because of the compulsion to exert effort toward a common goal. One can organize people. He can organize positions. He can organize things. He can organize through place and time. He can organize efforts, channeling them, directing them, encouraging them, frustrating them. The organization is the whole enterprise and the organizer works with the whole from top to bottom of any structural concept and from beginning to end of operation. If he ignores people, his organization must fail. If he ignores positioning, his organization descends into chaos. If he ignores the necessity for energizing the

machinery, the structure is without function and is helpless to serve the need for which it was set up. If he ignores operation, the organization breaks down through growing loss of coordination.

Many simple organizations are *informal* and come into existence out of the matrix of human relations in a group. Through time, such simple organizations may become far more complex and far more clearly structured, though still informal and unplanned. It is likely that an astute observer of a school organization of any size would see two organizations, a formal one established by law and custom and declared into being by chart and outline, and an informal one of person-to-person relationships and casual but customary procedures. Through which organization the task of the school is accomplished is a question. Both are necessary and both are real, though neither administrators nor others in the school may know by which organization a given action is being carried. The one seems an arrangement of *positions,* the other of *persons.* Yet the distinction is pat without being entirely true in either case. The formal organization provides an arrangement of positions and a channeling of functions with possibly a minimizing of differences in persons holding the positions.

The informal organization develops as a structure of personalities with, however, some attention paid to position and acknowledged authority. While the formal organization may be set up without regard to the personalities expressed within the organization, the informal organization reflects the formal structure to some extent in its own power-and-acceptance pattern. The holders of some administrative positions may be excluded from some forms of participation in the informal organization because of the positions occupied though their being in other positions would not so exclude them. All individuals in the formal organization have their parallel roles in the informal organization, although the power relationships and the communication channels are often strikingly different. An administrator can set himself and others to the tasks of planning the formal organization of the enterprise,

of placing the scheme on paper so that all persons involved may know the relationships between positions and the flow of activity through the organization, and of promulgating the paper organization as guide to operation. An administrator can only *discover* the informal organization through sensitivity to the reactions of persons in the organization to each other and to the operation which is under way. Those are the human factors which count heavily in organized effort.

The administrator should be an expert organizer, capable of developing a formal organization in keeping with the task to be accomplished, and capable of bringing about an informal organization in reinforcement of the effort to achieve the purposes of the enterprise. In this work of organizing, he may be a manipulator, a skilled group leader, a fine analyst, a politician, a dictator. He may be authoritarian or democratic. He may compel or induce. He may thwart creativity in persons in the organization or stimulate creativity toward the end of perfecting organization. The test of his capacity will be his creating, or leading to the creation, of organizational patterns best suited to the needs of the enterprise, in bringing about the required ways and means to accomplish the objectives of the enterprise in the most efficient and effective manner possible.

Seldom of course is it possible for the administrator to start at the beginning of development of the whole organization. With the exception of the simpler, short-range organizational arrangements which arise out of needs coming from the day-to-day operation of the enterprise, the formal organization is ordinarily in existence and the administrator's role is that of the reorganizer and improver of the organizational structure. Within the limits of the necessity for continuing an existing organization in order that operation not be interfered with to the disadvantage of the enterprise, the administrator can however lead toward the reconstitution of the organization along lines dictated by consideration of current requirements and criteria of efficiency. This undertaking

will call upon his organizing ability and his ability to work with the personnel of the organization and other persons whose approval and support may be necessary or desirable. Should law or custom present insurmountable or irremovable blocks temporarily or permanently to the development of the best possible organization, the organizing task may involve efforts to change law or to modify established and accepted practice.

The organization itself will condition the kind of operation and will limit the accomplishment of objectives. Weak organization of whatever nature will dissipate energy and will render some effort of little or no service toward the achievement of the goals of the enterprise. Strong organization will channel effort toward the objectives of the organization but may or may not be the best organization for such accomplishment. The "best" organization will of necessity be in terms of objectives and in terms of efficiency and effectiveness. Because every organization is conditioned most by the personnel within it, the "best" organization will be strongly based upon consideration of persons, individually and in groups. Since even dictators find it necessary to win again and again the consent of the governed and the cooperation of subordinates in the governmental hierarchy, it may be supposed that the "best" organization will be democratic in a sense or will at least enlist the active and willing participation of most organizational personnel in most of the administrative and operational activity of the enterprise.

There is some evidence of a growing belief that democracy is on more than an even basis with authoritarianism using efficiency as the criterion. "Best" may turn out to be the democratic organization in business, government, and school if the test is truly made even with philosophical and humanitarian considerations held in abeyance. No other organizational arrangement of many individuals affords such opportunity to enlist all abilities of all personnel. No other organizational pattern can so well keep open multiple lines of communication and so well provide opportunity for careful

and continuous evaluation. Of course, it is incorrect and a gross oversimplification to speak of *the* democratic organizational pattern when there are as many varieties of organization under democratic principles as there are under authoritarian principles. Weakness in organization and poor quality of organization can be present even where there is the greatest desire for democratic procedure and the outcome of operation can be as unfortunate as though the organization were badly designed under an authoritarian leader. Ineffectiveness and inefficiency must still be eliminated by developing an organization justified on the bases of effectiveness and efficiency in accomplishing the organizational objectives.

II

Some organizations come into being spontaneously as individuals are thrown together in some common undertaking. The social structure of the group may be determined almost immediately by the action-reaction of personalities, and the functional relationships may be established also at the moment the group is formed by individuals assuming without discussion tasks which when performed together will serve the group purpose. But except for simple groups meeting a temporary need for group association, such almost automatic organization will not occur. A group leader will appear to fix a group hierarchy and to secure the assignment of tasks probably on the basis of the relative felt-importance of the tasks and the interest in them expressed by the group members. If the group is to persist, there must be some general holding of similar interests with the objective of group action prized to at least a limited extent by every group member.

The school administrator works through organization with a compulsion upon him to invest much of his effort toward the acceptance of one or more common goals by all members of the group which he leads and the carrying-on of separate activities in easy coordination. "The prime necessity in all organization is har-

monious relations based on integrated interests ." says Mooney, who holds that organizing ability is requisite to leadership.

Organization has been termed the formal aide of administration, likewise the machinery of administration, the channel through which the measures and policies of administration become effective. There is truth in these descriptions, but not the whole truth. Again, organization has been called the framework of every group moving toward a common objective. Here also the simile is sound as far as it goes. It seems to imply that organization refers only to the differentiation of individual duties, as set forth in the familiar organization charts. But duties must relate to procedure, and it is here that we find the real dynamics of organization, the motive power through which it moves to its determined objective.

Organization, therefore, refers to more than the frame of the edifice. It refers to the complete body, with all its correlated functions. It refers to these functions as they appear in action, the very pulse and heartbeats, the circulation, the respiration, the vital movement, so to speak, of the organized unit. It refers to the coordination of all these factors as they cooperate for the common purpose.

This description of the relation between organization and administration also indicates what is meant by *system* in organization. As organization relates to procedure, involving the interrelation of duties as well as duties in themselves, so system may be described as the technique of procedure.

The introduction of the word "technique" gives us another slant on the relation of administration to organization. It might appear that organization is in some way subordinated to administration. In a practical sense, so it is, for the instrument must always appear subordinate to that of which it is the instrument, and one duty of administration is to organize. Yet in another sense the relation is reversed. If the building presupposes the builder, or organizer, the function of administration also presupposes the building, or something to administer. Let us, therefore, compare these two in terms of technique.

The art or technique of administration, in its human relations, can be described as the art of directing and inspiring people, which must be based on a deep and enlightened human understanding. The technique

of organization may be described as that of relating specific duties or functions in a coordinated whole. This statement of the difference between organizing and administering clearly shows their intimate relation. It shows also, which is our present purpose, that the technique of organizing is prior, in logical order, to that of administering. A sound organizer may be a poor leader or administrator, because his temperamental qualities may not fit him for the latter task. On the other hand, it is inconceivable that a poor organizer can ever make a good leader, if he has any real organizing work to do.

The prime necessity in all organization is harmonious relations based on integrated interests, and, to this end, the first essential is an integrated relation of the duties, considered in themselves. This means that the sound coordination of the activities of all the people on the jobs demands, as its necessary antecedent, the sound coordination of the jobs as such. It is evident, therefore, that a good job of organizing is a necessary antecedent to efficient administration. Administration always presupposes something tangible to administer, and this something only organization can supply.

All history bears witness to the reality of that something we may call organizing genius, as truly creative as the genius manifested in the realms of creative art. Indeed, organization is an art, and, as such, it must have its technique, based on principles. That the great organizers of history applied these principles unconsciously proves only that their technique was inherent in their genius. Nevertheless, all experience proves that a technique can be acquired, and the more readily if its underlying principles are known.[1]

If organizing is an art, as Mooney suggests, it becomes that in integrating a subtle sense of proportion with an appreciation of relationships between persons, between persons and functions, between functions and functions, and between processes and the ends to be attained.

Organization, dealing as it does with human relationships, is at once the most intriguing and the most difficult of all phases of management.

[1] James D. Mooney, *The Principles of Organization,* Harper & Brothers, New York, 1939, pp. 2–4.

In spite of the difficulty of comprehending its nature, organization must be recognized as the most important of all the means of direction and control that the chief executive of a business has at his command. The organization is the nervous system of a company.

Whenever two or more persons combine their efforts in a definite way for a given purpose, there is an organization. To be more specific, an organization structure consists of relationships not only between one person and another, as between a superintendent and a foreman, but between people and the work to which they are assigned. Some of these relationships are intangible. The latter, which are the most important, can be understood and appreciated only by "insiders." Relationships are therefore the basic element used in the design of organization structures.

Whenever a great many workers are employed, the relationships among them are numerous and involved. Consequently, some relatively fixed arrangement of these relationships is essential. Such an arrangement may be termed the "organization structure." Just what form of structure will prove best for any given firm depends upon its objectives, the caliber of men available, and the particular conditions under which they work. Even the determination of how an organization may best be subdivided depends upon its own peculiar aims and conditions. Structure is not an end in itself, but it can increase or decrease the effectiveness of those who operate under it.[2]

Dale separates organization into two parts, *planning* and *structure.* He considers organizational planning to be a process of establishing desirable relationships within the structure in keeping with the activities being carried on.

Organization planning is the process of defining and grouping the activities of the enterprise so that they may be most logically assigned and effectively executed. It is concerned with the establishment of relationships among the units so as to further the objectives of the enterprise. The following basic characteristics of organization should be kept in mind in any discussion of organization planning:

[2] C. C. Balderston and Others, *Management of An Enterprise,* Prentice-Hall, Inc., New York, 1949, pp. 447–448.

1. Organization is a planning process. It is concerned with setting up, developing and maintaining a structure or pattern of working relationships of the people within an enterprise. It is carried on continuously as changes in events, personalities and environment require. Thus organization is dynamic. However, the resulting structure is static—i.e., it reflects the organization only as of a given moment of time.

2. Organization is the determination and assignment of duties to people so as to obtain the advantages of fixing responsibility and specialization through subdivision of work.

3. Organization is a plan for integrating or coordinating most effectively the activities of each part of the enterprise so that proper relationships are established and maintained among the different work units and so that the total effort of all people in the enterprise will help accomplish its objectives.

4. Organization is a means to an end. Good organization should be one of the tools of accomplishing the company's objectives, but it should not become an objective in itself.[3]

Though it can be demonstrated that power of group action is released and made effective through organization, one may find that individuals become restive under organization or under their concept of organization. There appears sometimes a connotation of machinery, red tape, officiousness rather than warm, human relations among individuals joined in a group effort. Even among persons in key administrative positions there may appear evidences of restiveness in terms of revolt against detail and routine. But if organization is good, it frees individuals to make their particular contributions to the group effort although it also emphasizes group membership of the individual. Dubin recognizes this response to the individual's concept of the organization in which he acts, but he suggests that large group activity and large organization are inseparable.

Stop for a moment and think of some possible alternatives for organizing a large body of people. Suppose we start with 1,000 people.

[3] Ernest Dale, *Planning and Developing the Company Organization Structure,* American Management Association, New York, 1952, p. 14.

One way to organize them into a cooperating group is to have each one in direct relationship with a leader. But, you will say, that is manifestly impossible. What about span of control? Can one man be in constant interaction with a thousand and direct their activities effectively? Obviously, the answer is NO. What you will propose immediately is some kind of structure of delegated authority and responsibility. We must have a group of subleaders standing in an intermediate position between the leader and the followers or members of the group. This in-between group of administrators we can label the bureaucracy of an organization.

Let us start on our problem of organizing our thousand people from the opposite extreme. Suppose we say that the group will be able to work out its cooperative activity without any direction or leadership. Pure democracy will reign. Yes, you will say on slight reflection, but in order to give continuity to the group's activities, some body of men, smaller in number than the total, must carry on certain delegated activities. Furthermore, you might contend, if for no other reason than to stand as a symbol of the group as a whole, there will be one or several people designated in the office of leader. Starting from quite a different standpoint, we still come out with an in-between group, which is neither membership alone nor leadership alone, to which we can apply the label, bureaucracy.

Does this give us our point of departure for understanding the technical concept of bureaucracy? We need some way of talking about the group of organization functionaries who are more than members but less than over-all leaders. To this in-between group of an organization we apply the term bureaucracy. The individual we call the bureaucrat.

Every organization that is big enough will develop a bureaucracy. We find bureaucracies in government (the classic instance), in religious organizations, in fraternal groups, in educational institutions, in business firms, and even in organized sports. A bureaucracy is a form of social organization for administering the affairs of a formal organization. In a sense, we can look upon a bureaucracy as a social invention for administering a heterogeneous group of people in a corporate activity.

Bureaucratic administration was invented when large formal organizations (corporate groups) were developed, bringing together mixed

groups of people with dissimilar backgrounds to perform a complex, coordinated task.[4]

Though the school administrator desirably should keep his eyes on the goals to be achieved and on the product of the organization he leads, he needs to be constantly an organizer, studying organization as a foundational element of his administration and seeking the perfection of organization as a tool by which administration works. Preoccupation with routine and detail to the exclusion of the administrator's seeing the whole process of the school is of course often harmful. But examination of organization in its proper relation to the process which is to be carried on is a requisite of good administration.

in good engineering practice design must come first. Similarly in good social practice design should come first the main sufferers from a lack of design in organization are the individuals who work in the undertaking. If an employer buys a man without any clear idea in his own mind of the exact duties for which he requires him and the kind of qualifications needed to discharge those duties, the chances are that he will blame the man if the results do not correspond with his vague notion of what he wanted him for.

It is wasteful because unless jobs are clearly put together along lines of functional specialization it is impossible to train new men to succeed to positions as the incumbents are promoted, resign or retire. A man cannot be trained to take over another's special personal experience: and yet if jobs are fitted to men rather than men to jobs that is precisely what the employer must try to do. Consequently, every change in personnel becomes a crisis, an experiment in personalities.

It is inefficient, because if an organization is not founded on principles, then those directing it have nothing to fall back on but personalities. The personal touch is important. Kindliness, tact, generosity of spirit as between colleagues are invaluable lubricants in any kind of undertaking. But the administrator who tries to substitute ami-

[4] Robert Dubin, *Human Relations in Administration,* Prentice-Hall, Inc., New York, 1951, pp. 154–155.

ability for definite planning in questions or organization will find sooner rather than later that "the personal touch" issues in an epidemic of personal touchiness. Unless there are principles on which he can fall back and which are understood by everyone in the undertaking, it is inevitable that in matters of promotion and similar issues men will start "playing politics."

Emphasis has been laid on this question of thinking consciously and technically about organization, of laying our structure first and not thinking about individuals till structure has been determined, because it is still rare to find any general acceptance of this principle. The majority of social groups being left to grow like Topsy find, sooner rather than later, that Topsy has married Turvy.

In short, a very large proportion of the friction and confusion in current society, with its manifest consequences in human suffering, may be traced directly to faulty organization in the structural sense. A machine will not run smoothly when fundamental engineering principles have been ignored in its construction. Attempts to run it will inevitably impose quite unnecessary and unbearable strain on its components.[5]

Because most administrators must act through organizations already formed, the organizational facts include the persons within the organization and for the most part the administrator must endeavor to make the organization function in terms of personalities involved as well as in terms of the activities which must be brought into satisfactory relationship with each other. But the importance of seeing the organization apart from the persons in it is emphasized by Urwick as a step toward improving the organizational structure with or without changes in personnel.

It is not impossible to forget provisionally the personal facts—that old Brown is admirably methodical but wanting in initiative, that young Smith got into a mess with Robinson's wife and that the two men must be kept at opposite ends of the building, that Jones is one of those creatures who can think like a Wrangler about other people's duties but is given to periodic amnesia about certain aspects of his own.

[5] L. Urwick, *The Elements of Administration,* Harper & Brothers, New York, 1943, pp. 38–39.

He should never for a moment pretend that these difficulties don't exist. They do exist: they are realities. Nor, when he has drawn up an ideal plan of organization, is it likely that he will be able to fit in all the existing human material perfectly. There will be small adjustments of the job to the man in all kinds of directions. But those adjustments can be made without harm, provided they are conscious adjustments, deliberate and temporary deviations from pattern in order to deal with idiosyncrasy. There is a world of difference between such modifications and drifting into an unworkable organization because Green has a fancy for combining bits of two incompatible functions, or White is "empire building,". or Black has always looked after the canteen, so when he is promoted to Sales Manager he might just as well continue to sell buns internally, though the main product of the business happens to be battleships.

Personal adjustments must be made, in so far as they are necessary. But fewer of them will be necessary and they will present fewer deviations from what is logical and simple, if the organizer first makes a plan, a design—to which he would work if he had the ideal human material. He should expect to be driven from it here and there. But if he starts with a motley collection of human oddities and tries to organize to fit them all in, thinking first of their various shapes and sizes and colors, he may have a patchwork quilt; he will not have an organization.[6]

In an earlier statement, Urwick took a similar position with respect to the playing-down of personal factors in organization and pointed out that much of the difficulty met with in reconstructing organizations lies in the attitudes of persons in the organizations. While he did not suggest that problems of personality could be ignored, he held that important to the organizing function was attention to the application of technical principles.

The "practical" difficulties of applying technical principles in organization, even when their validity is admitted intellectually, are great. Personal factors obtrude. They cannot be ignored. But that they should

[6] L. Urwick, *The Elements of Administration,* Harper & Brothers, New York, 1943, pp. 36–37.

always and on all occasions be given priority in consideration is fantastic. The idea that organizations should be built up around and adjusted to individual idiosyncrasies, rather than that individuals should be adapted to the requirements of sound principles of organization, is as foolish as attempting to design an engine to accord with the whimsies of one's maiden aunt rather than with the laws of mechanical science. Individuals are the raw material of organization. There is some freedom of choice, some elasticity for adjustment, in large enterprises a great deal. That an engineer in the wilderness should build a bridge of such materials as he can find is inevitable. That an engineer in a complex industrialized area should do the same is unthinkable. Even in the wilderness the trained engineer will build his bridge in accordance with principles. It will be a better bridge: there will be less strain and the materials will last longer.

Insistence on the personal standpoint in organization almost invariably implies an attempt to secure for some individual or for some group special privileges at the expense of their colleagues. It may be the chief who prefers to occupy his time with detail and his opportunities for straightening out personal situations with patronage. It may be subordinate officials who suspect that conservative insistence on the "status quo," and not their personal qualifications for positions of responsibility, is the best guarantee they have of whatever authority they at present enjoy. It may be elements in the rank and file who have developed "defence mechanisms" against some of the worst consequences of bad organization, and prefer to maintain their habits rather than to risk a change.

Whatever the motive underlying persistence in bad structure it is always more hurtful to the greatest number than good structure. It opens the way to every type of dishonesty and intrigue.

More serious is the inertia of current practice. Men accept existing forms of organization at the point to which they have evolved as a matter of course. That they have been different in the past is ignored. The suggestion that enterprises for other purposes may have the same needs, be suffering from the same conditions, which have compelled that evolution, alone rouses resistance. The resistance is reinforced by what the French call "déformation professionelle," the tendency to

look at all questions from a particular point of view, to assume that in respect of the individual's own profession what is must be best, which seems to result inevitably from the long and intensive practice of a particular calling. It is intellectually incapable of imagining alternative arrangements and insensitive to considerations other than those current in the given group. It is often associated with great disinterestedness and sense of public service.[7]

The organization with which Urwick is so much concerned is the formal organization as contrasted to the informal one through which is carried on a very great deal of the activity of the whole organization. Though consideration of the formal organization can be given without attending to the characteristics and personalities of particular people in the group, the informal organization becomes what it is because of the people who compose it. It is possible to visualize a school organization on paper and to imagine its operation. In practice, of course, the organization does not function exactly according to the organizational chart. The pattern may be honored in general and individuals may believe that they are acting in accord with the organization as charted. Yet short cuts in process and common sense adjustments to changing situations can make functional alignments not known to the chart-makers. Many such modifications are made because of particular personalities in the group and disappear as group membership changes. A school system may establish a fine supervisory staff so that teachers might have all help desired, but experience may demonstrate that teachers often turn to fellow teachers for advice and assistance, thus failing to use the supervisory organization as it was designed to be used. A school custodian, shown on the organizational chart to be under the direction of the building principal or other school officer, may in practice be honoring requests by teachers for his services and serve all well though formally accountable to only one person. If the multiplicity of directors of his work causes confusion, the

[7] L. Urwick, "Organization As a Technical Problem," *Papers on the Science of Administration,* Luther Gulick and L. Urwick (editors), Institute of Public Administration, New York, 1937, pp. 85–86.

administrator may pass word that all requests must be "properly" channeled in keeping with the organizational pattern. But depending upon the personality of the custodian and the personalities of the several teachers, the violation of the chain-of-command principle will occur again and again as common sense or convenience dictates.

The administrator who frowns on the short cuts and unofficial activities by which personnel in the organization seem to secure some immediate objectives should be cautious about disturbing the kind of human relations in the organization which permits accomplishment outside the formal channels of operation. If the accomplishment is of a kind serving the general purposes of the organization and if the modification in process does not weaken the formal organization, the informal practice can add to the efficiency of the enterprise. Though the supervisory staff may be established to answer questions teachers may raise, many questions are better answered by fellow teachers in the school situation in which the question is raised and in terms of the particular conditions which prevail at the time of the question. When a teacher needs the special service of the school custodian, insistence upon requests being made to a custodial supervisory officer rather than to the custodian directly may prevent a need from being met. It is likely that in all schools the custodial staff performs many tasks not contemplated when organizational charts were drawn and duties assigned.

There is much truth in the declaration that most organizations would be tied up in their own processes if it were not for the modifications and irregularities of the informal organization which accompanies the formal organization. Nothing could be more hampering to the operation of a military organization than the observance to the letter of all rules and regulations. Unwritten in most promulgations of rules and regulations is the practical abjuration that common sense be employed to make the regulations fit the situations in which they are employed. While such modi-

fication presents an ever-present danger that the intention of the regulation will be thwarted, the lack of informal modification presents a very real danger also that the intention will not be served.

The human organizational relationships evidenced in many informal modifications of practice are of deep concern to the administrator who, though organizer of functions and group relations, must be fundamentally a leader of the persons who give life to the organization.

> A man may be described as a "great organizer," because he is energetic and forceful and ruthless so that he secures quick results. In fact, the application of those qualities to a delicate human situation may be calculated to make chaos of various relationships which have hitherto governed the performance of the undertaking. The man is in fact an eminent disorganizer.[8]

But, as Lepawsky points out, there may be considered to be a "science of organization" in which principles of both formal and informal organization are developed, not with one or the other being held more important but with both significant to the planning and carrying on of group activity.

The technician who sets out to master the science of organization today concerns himself with much more than the perfect chart or the last screw. He understands, contrary to contemporary critics like Juenger, that organization, even in its depressive connotations, is as old as mankind. He knows from his reading of human experience that organizations cannot be dispensed with, but they can certainly be effectively used and responsibly controlled, providing they are properly constructed and operated. This will take a knowledge that exceeds any one aspect of organizational science: departmental organization, single versus plural executives, congressional or commission forms, parliamentary and presidential systems, capitalist versus collectivist organizations. There is a need to test and to apply some of the simplest lessons, not

[8] L. Urwick, *The Elements of Administration,* Harper & Brothers, New York, 1943, p. 35.

merely the theoretical doctrines, of private and public organizations. This includes the lesson that among the basic elements of organization are not only the micro-motions produced by time-and-motion studies of physical acts or the "psycho-motions" of the intellectual and non-physical activities involved in administration, but also the individual men and women who are acting or being acted upon as total personalities. When the individual is more fully recognized as a basic unit in the emerging science of organization, it will become more apparent that the static subject of organization is a vital force in a dynamic society.[9]

To aid the study of organization and to discover ways by which existing organizations can be improved, Holden, Fish, and Smith urge the importance of organizational charts and reflect the findings of a survey made by them of business organizations.

A good organization chart for the company as a whole, with auxiliary charts for each major division, is an essential first step in the analysis, clarification, and understanding of any organization plan. The process of charting the organization is one good test of its soundness, as any organization relationship which cannot be readily charted is likely to be illogical and therefore confusing to those working under it.

Organization charts should be supplemented by written specifications defining the essential requirements of each level of management, each department, each committee, and each key job or group of similar jobs. Only by a thorough understanding of their respective parts in the whole management picture are individual executives and agencies able to devote their full energies to effective discharge of their proper functions, avoiding duplication of effort, friction, and working at cross purposes which result from lack of organization clarification. Such written specifications should cover functions, jurisdiction, responsibilities, relationships, limits of authority, objectives, and the means of measuring performance.[10]

[9] Albert Lepawsky, *Administration,* Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., New York, 1949, p. 255.

[10] By permission from *Top-Management Organization and Control* by Paul E. Holden, Lounsbury S. Fish, and Hubert L. Smith. Copyright, 1951. McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc. Pp. 5–8.

It is easy to undervalue the "paper machinery" by which much is accomplished in large organizations. But whether the organizational chart, the filing system, the communications activity, or other similar aspects of the organization are under surveillance, the fact remains that without such "paper machinery" the human organization of any size would be helpless to operate. During World War II, much humorous comment was directed at the apparent military necessity to have typewriters and mimeographs go ashore with the first assault waves. Apart from the humor of the association of typewriters and ammunition, much can be said for the importance of means of communication of all kinds in the organization of military units for invasion. Sears looks seriously at the "paper machinery" of a school system.

Since all the organizations of information, facts, and materials used in a school system are designed to promote the joint efforts of the officers, employees, pupils, and others having dealings with the schools, we may think of all such organizations as the paper machinery, essential as a means of defining and giving orderly direction to the human machinery of the school system. Since the persons of an organization use this paper machinery constantly, the problem of organizing the facts, materials, and procedures is so closely connected with the human machinery that, in reality, it is but a part of the problem of organizing the people.

Although each unit of any school organization may require special study to develop, yet, whether it be a daily work schedule for a class, a card catalogue by which to locate books in the library, a curriculum to be followed by a thousand students, a budget to govern revenues and expenses for the entire school system for a year; or (of persons) whether it be a committee, a class, a school, or the major structure of the entire school system, in all cases alike, need for the unit arises in the need to facilitate cooperative effort. Each unit, paper or human, therefore, is but a part of a complex whole. Things on paper are but reflections of facts needed by persons or of prearranged procedures for the use of persons. They are guides for the persons who are doing the work. They express in word, figure, formula, or picture, many details for ready reference and review, which the persons would often not be

able to carry wholly in mind, but without which they could not work harmoniously with others or consistently with their own previous procedures.

The part of the total mechanism of an organization that is on paper is far more extensive and important than is generally realized. The items above listed are but a few samples of the organizing activities required and of the organized forms and data used continuously in a school system. The procedure of a class reciting has been so planned by the teacher that it may go forward in an orderly way, orderly from the standpoint of the way the children may best move in their learning activities in that instance. Facts from many sources, current and historical facts pertaining to each child, are assembled on a card, arranged with a view to facilitating consultation of that source by the teacher or counselor or principal of the school. The book of rules and regulations setting forth a definition of purposes, powers, and duties; outlining programs and procedures; and authorizing use of specified materials is far more minute, exact, and dependable guide to action than what anyone can carry in his mind as an assignment to duty by his employer. Such a book of directions is organized with a view to making every item easy to find by a reader, and especially to enable one to see his own place in the total plan of organization.

The paper machinery might be thought of as the working tools or as specifications for the guidance of the human machinery, but it seems desirable here to stress the close connection it has with the human machine. It carries loads that otherwise would have to be carried in memory and that would have to be sure to be recalled at every proper time and place. It does even more than this; it keeps facts, definitions, divisions of labor, purposes, plans, procedures, all defined in unchanging terms. Paper organizations never forget; they have no selfish motives, no pride in getting more power. They are never lazy or mean or indifferent, and they need not be stupid. It is true that at times they crystallize things that should be kept elastic, and, at times, may even prevent growth; but they need not do these evil things. Their virtue is consistency, continuity, completeness, permanence, readiness for action—all bases for common understanding. It is not their fault if the personal machine neglects to keep them alive. It is on this point of keeping them alive that we see how organizing and reorganizing become a con-

tinuous obligation of the personal machine. A sawyer never starts a log toward the saw until he has adjusted the carrying mechanism. All paper parts of an organization need similar, if less frequent, readjustments for use.

From this it is clear that any organization that exists as a plan for extensive cooperative action is complicated enough as to its own nature, as to the tasks it performs and as to the procedures it must use, so that no one person can carry in mind full directions for all that the organization requires of him as one of its members. So, to supplement this mental picture an extensive paper machinery must be used as a means of extending the reach of the personal powers of the participants.[11]

Critics of administrative practice in and out of school situations have maintained that in many ways traditional concepts of organization have performed a disservice to democratic principles. DeHuszar advances an argument for problem-centered groups and has much in favor of his stand if one considers how informal organizations work.

Consider the organizational implications of the problem-centered-group. Hierarchy, as a system, is probably rooted in the concept of the universe that prevailed before Columbus discovered America. The earth was flat, with heaven above, hell below. Such being the world view, an organizational system based on "upness" and "downness" was quite natural. We have changed the world view. We still have the system.

Hierarchical organizational structure is usually based on too much verbalism; the method of exhortation. The various examples given show that such a system of "upness" and "downness" is not efficient. Words moving down telling those at the scene of action what to do, do not tell all, they do not tell it sharply and accurately.

If, however, problem-centered-groups were built within large organizations, we would gradually modify hierarchy from top down to one wherein the management would be within—more from center out.

[11] By permission from *The Nature of the Administrative Process* by Jesse B. Sears. Copyright, 1950. McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc. Pp. 91–93.

This implies that organizations would be multiple-centered, and based less on exhortation from the faraway top.

Problem-centered-groups are "circles" within a line organization. They stimulate circulation. Circulation is essential to health, vigor, alertness and adaptability to change, both in a human body and in an organization of men and women. When circulation is low in a human body, we get stiff joints, slow movement, sluggish thinking, hardening of the arteries, etc. Similar things happen when circulation is low in a large organization.

Problem-centered-groups help to "streamline" an organization. They make it more efficient. *But they create more than efficiency. They create satisfaction in employees as well as a more democratic social structure.* Thus it is possible to combine efficiency and democracy; a reconciliation which has been one of the most difficult problems of democratic society.[12]

Organization for democratic operation concerns deHuszar in the following paragraphs.

The task of democratic integration is to deal with disintegrating institutions and to transform authoritarian institutions into democratic ones.

Some of our institutions reflect the prevailing tendency toward disintegration. They are full of internal weakness. Often they are just institutional shells which cover up incoherence, confusion, and disintegration. On the other hand some of our institutions—corporations, political parties, schools, labor unions, etc.—have too much of the authoritarian in them. Power is concentrated and control is exercised at the top, action being taken without opportunities for those concerned to have any say about it. Thus, we tend to be democratic in words, but authoritarian in acts.

In such institutions we have too much "power-over," rather than "power-with." These institutions are mechanistic. This tendency toward mechanization, rigidity, and authority results in institutional hardening of arteries. The older institutions get, the more likely they are to be

[12] George B. deHuszar, *Practical Applications of Democracy,* Harper & Brothers, New York, 1945, pp. 99–101.

formalized and uninspired. It is an everlasting struggle to keep institutions from becoming "institutionalized."

The methods of consent-democracy are ineffective when faced with the task of integration and the transformation of authoritarian institutions into truly democratic ones. On the other hand, do-democracy makes not only action but integration and such transformation, possible.

Consent-democracy often treats the individual as an abstraction, an isolated being representing votes. It is interested in an arithmetic problem: majorities. But the registering of opinions, which is an additive process, cannot lead to integration. On the other hand, do-democracy does not think of individuals as crude numbers but seeks to unify them. *Participation, bring people together, creates integration.* As M. P. Follett pointed out the aim of conference is integration, rather than compromise. Consent-democracy, on the other hand, is based on balance and compromise; the representative assembly and the party system have these as aims.

Neither is consent-democracy an efficient solution for making hierarchical organization less authoritarian. The mere right of the worker to vote once in awhile on some matters in the factory, of the pupil to vote in the student council, of the citizen to vote for a party, will not make any of these persons an effective participant.

Do-democracy, based on genuine participation, leads to a type of organization where there is a place for the creative activity of all. Organization from above tends to be authoritarian while organization from within tends to be democratic, relying on the free interplay of the participants. *The warm, personal, satisfying human relationships that develop when men join together in groups have the power to change the spirit and form of the artificial up-down-system that makes so many of our institutions so formal and verbal.*

It is not the size but the prevalent internal structure of large institutions which is wrong. If decentralization is combined with co-ordination, bigness and impersonality—which are great threats to democracy—will not be such grave problems. Groups are the bases of such decentralizations. Such groups are centers of integration for they enable the average man to participate in something big: pupil in education, citizen in government, worker in industry, and so forth.

Participation will lead to a more democratic organization. It would gradually lessen the sharp separation between teacher and pupil, government official and citizen, and manager and laborer.

The impetus and initiative for action must come from the individuals themselves. Integration cannot be imposed from above. It has not much to do with appropriations or legislation by Congress. Social structure is not something outside and above, but is simply the name we give to the multitudes of man-to-man relationships.[13]

III

There are many school administrators who have led their organizations well and have been instrumental in causing the school systems to serve well the needs of the community. Many are good organizers, securing the best results from their organizations at a minimum of organizational strain. Modifications in school practice have been brought about in the interest of better educational service and, in general, professional staffs are more effective in what they do than were teachers in schools a generation or two ago. Educational provision has been pushed downward through the kindergarten commonly and upward not quite so commonly through the first college years or into the area of adult education apart from college.

But school administrators and others have not been bold innovators in organization. School organization is essentially what it was many years ago. Alterations have been by patch upon patch, changing importantly in many instances but for the most part not fundamentally. No change in school pattern comparable in significance to those stimulated by Horace Mann have marked the years since his great work in the interest of developing schools which could better serve the needs of the people. Curriculum changes have been common. Structural changes have been uncommon, and when made they have been in the nature of adjusting an old

[13] George B. deHuszar, *Practical Applications of Democracy,* Harper & Brothers, New York, 1945, pp. 16–18.

mechanism to new pressures rather than creating a new structure in terms of the needs of the time. Sadly enough, many modifications in local school organization have come into being because of a lack of classrooms to house pupils not because a change in organization would contribute to better education. Even in the second great wave of school district reorganization in the United States, modification has for the most part been unaccompanied by fundamental changes in structure although consolidation of districts may make only *bigger* not necessarily *better* school systems unless the new school systems are new, not just larger, organizations.

It is likely that through the years school administrators have been much more ready to accept the challenge of making old forms work in new times than to accept the challenge of developing new forms in keeping with new times. The latter challenge cannot be ignored much longer if public schools are to continue to perform their historic service to society. Circumstances will force the issue sooner or later and, in some places, have already profoundly disturbed school administrators who find that old machinery and old ways of doing things are unequal to the tasks being thrust upon the schools.

One of the pressures has already been felt strongly and is evidenced by the greater participation of teachers in policy-making and administration of school systems. The wide acceptance of the idea that school administration should be democratic has, for example, brought the committee system into general use though the organization of the schools may be along authoritarian lines rather than democratic ones. The superintendent of schools as dictator to subordinates is a vanishing type, but the organizational chart of the school system may show him answerable only to the board of education. The practical administrator has learned that he now must work *with* personnel in the school organization or be defeated by them. But perhaps almost everywhere the democratic school administrator is trying to make a democratic approach to

school problems through an organization designed for orders from the top down not for consultation, group decision, and cooperative action.

Another pressure for change upon the school organization is the enlargement of the assigned responsibilities of the school in American life. If a school ever had only the three R's as its assignment, it no longer can carry on so simple a task. But the question is: Can a school designed to teach a few children in a few grades a few things teach many children of many abilities all the things that a modern school is asked by the community to teach? If the problem is faced directly, it would appear that the complex school program now calls for a completely reconstituted school organization permitting efficiency at reasonable cost and with high effectiveness.

In keeping with the broadening of the curricular offering for the school system's child population is the offering by the school of services to the community in the form of adult education, recreation, extended use of buildings for community activity, and out-of-school educational leadership. Many school systems are absorbing the strains of such additional services by organizations created under different expectancy.

Still another pressure is exerted by the increasing child population which must be housed and educated by a school organization not adapted to making rapid adjustments according to load.

Out of these pressures has come another which may in this decade compel the thoroughgoing reorganization of school systems. Presently, there are not enough teachers to staff the school systems in the way which has become traditional. During the decade and in the future, this condition will not change for the better if current inadequate enrollments in teacher education programs and the loss to the profession of teachers who move into other occupations are indications of things to come. The desire to have one well-qualified teacher for every group of thirty children in elementary school is not now and will not be satisfied in the near future. The secondary

school presents a similarly dark picture with respect to the supply of qualified teachers in a time of sharply increasing school populations. The answer to the need for meeting adequately the educational requirements of all the children must be found in reorganizing schools completely so that better use is made of the ability of good teachers and of other resources of the school system. If the teacher shortage forces educators to face directly the necessity for a fundamental reorganization of schools, much good may come of the unfortunate condition in which schools now find themselves. The perfect school organization for the accomplishment of the educational task as we see it has not now been devised nor will it ever be achieved, but important progress in its direction can be made through the critical study of the structures we have thus far created to serve our school needs.

The creative administrator must be an organizer working through people to secure the performance of the functions the schools were established to carry on. As changing times bring new necessities to the schools, so should school organizations change to meet the new demands upon them. The challenge to the school executive is constant. The satisfaction in improved school organization is in the realization of better education through better schools.

REFERENCES

APPLEBY, PAUL H., *Big Democracy,* Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., New York, 1945, chaps. 9, 10.

APPLEBY, PAUL H., *Policy and Administration,* University of Alabama Press, University, Alabama, 1949, chap. 4.

ARENDT, HANNAH, *The Origins of Totalitarianism,* Harcourt, Brace and Company, New York, 1951, chap. 11.

BAKKE, E. WRIGHT, *Bonds of Organization,* Harper & Brothers, New York, 1950.

BALDERSTON, C. CANBY, BRECHT, ROBERT P., KARABASZ, VICTOR S., and RIDDLE, ROBERT J., *Management of an Enterprise,* 2d ed., Prentice-Hall, Inc., New York, 1949, chaps. 27, 28.

BARNARD, CHESTER I., *The Functions of the Executive,* Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1948.

BARNARD, CHESTER I., *Organization and Management,* Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1948, chaps. 5, 9.

BENNE, KENNETH D., and MUNTYAN, BOZIDAR, *Human Relations in Curriculum Change,* The Dryden Press, New York, 1951.

BETHEL, LAWRENCE L., ALWATER, FRANKLIN S., SMITH, GEORGE H. E., STUCKMAN, HARVEY A. JR., *Industrial Organization and Management,* 2d ed., McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., New York, 1950, chap. 6.

BROWN, ALVIN, *Organization A Formulation of Principle,* Hibbert Printing Company, New York, 1945.

BROWN, ALVIN, *Organization of Industry,* Prentice-Hall, Inc., New York, 1947, chaps. 1, 2, 3, 4.

DALE, ERNEST, *Planning and Developing the Company Organization Structure,* American Management Association, New York, 1952, part I.

DAVIS, RALPH C., *The Fundamentals of Top Management,* Harper & Brothers, New York, 1951, chaps. 10, 11, 12, 13, 14.

DAVIS, RICHARD CURRIER, *Industrial Organization and Management,* Harper & Brothers, New York, 1940, chaps. 2, 3, 4.

DEHUSZAR, GEORGE B., *Practical Applications of Democracy,* Harper & Brothers, New York, 1945, chaps. 1, 2, 3, 9.

DIMOCK, MARSHALL E., *The Executive in Action,* Harper & Brothers, New York, 1945, chaps. 2, 3, 4, 14, 15.

DIMOCK, MARSHALL E., *Free Enterprise and the Administrative State,* University of Alabama Press, University, Alabama, 1951, chap. 3.

DUBIN, ROBERT, *Human Relations in Administration,* Prentice-Hall, Inc., New York, 1951, chaps. 2, 4, 5, 10, 20.

FAYOL, HENRI, *General and Industrial Management,* Sir Isaac Pitman & Sons, Ltd., London, 1949.

GARDNER, BURLEIGH B., and MOORE, DAVID G., *Human Relations in Industry,* rev. ed., Richard D. Irwin, Inc., Chicago, 1950.

GULICK, LUTHER, and URWICK, L. (editors), *Papers on the Science of Administration,* New York, 1937.

HEMPEL, EDWARD H. (editor), *Small Plant Management,* McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., New York, 1950, chap. 6.

HOLDEN, PAUL E., FISH, LOUNSBERRY S., and SMITH, HUBERT L., *Top-Management Organization and Control,* McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1951, parts A, B.

HOSLETT, SCHUYLER DEAN, *Human Factors in Management,* rev. ed., Harper & Brothers, New York, 1951, part VII.

HYNEMAN, CHARLES S., *Bureaucracy in a Democracy,* Harper & Brothers, New York, 1950, chap. 20.

INTERNATIONAL CITY MANAGERS' ASSOCIATION, *Local Planning Administration,* 2d ed., International City Managers' Association, Chicago, 1948, chap. 3.

KIMBALL, DEXTER S., and KIMBALL, DEXTER S., JR., *Principles of Industrial Organization,* 5th ed., McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., New York, 1939, chap. 9.

LEIGHTON, ALEXANDER H., *The Governing of Men,* Princeton University Press, Princeton, New Jersey, 1946, part II.

LEPAWSKY, ALBERT, *Administration,* Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., New York, 1949, part II.

LIVINGSTON, ROBERT T., *The Engineering of Organization and Management,* McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., New York, 1949.

MARX, FRITZ MORSTEIN (editor), *Elements of Public Administration,* Prentice-Hall, Inc., New York, 1946, chaps. 7, 13.

MERRIAM, CHARLES E., *Public and Private Government,* Yale University Press, New Haven, Connecticut, 1944, chaps. 3, 4.

MILWARD, G. E., *An Approach to Management,* Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1947.

MOONEY, JAMES D., *The Principles of Organization,* rev. ed., Harper & Brothers, New York, 1947.

NEWMAN, WILLIAM H., *Administrative Action,* Prentice-Hall, Inc., New York, 1951, part II.

NEWMAN, WILLIAM H., *Business Policies and Management,* 2d ed., South-Western Publishing Company, Cincinnati, 1947, chaps. 15, 16, 17, 18.

PFIFFNER, JOHN M., *Public Administration,* rev. ed., The Ronald Press Company, New York, 1946, chaps. 4, 5, 6.

ROETHLISBERGER, F. J., *Management and Morale,* Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1950, chap. 4.

ROSENFARB, JOSEPH, *Freedom and the Administrative State,* Harper & Brothers, New York, 1948, chap. 3.
SIMON, HERBERT A., *Administrative Behavior,* The Macmillan Company, New York, 1947.
TEAD, ORDWAY, *The Art of Administration,* McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., New York, 1951, chaps. 2, 3.
TRUNDLE, GEORGE T., JR. (editor), *Managerial Control of Business,* John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York, 1948, chap. 12.
URWICK, L., *The Elements of Administration,* Harper & Brothers, New York, 1943.
WALDO, DWIGHT, *The Administrative State,* The Ronald Press Company, New York, 1948, chap. 9.
WATKINS, GORDON S., DODD, PAUL A., MCNAUGHTON, WAYNE L., and PRASOW, PAUL, *The Management of Personnel and Labor Relations,* 2d ed., McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., New York, 1950, chap. 3.
WHITE, LEONARD, *Introduction to the Study of Public Administration,* 3d ed., The Macmillan Company, New York, 1948, chaps. 3, 17.

CHAPTER V

The Factor of Authority in Administration

Is there such a thing as authority of the situation in administrative activity?

Is authority granted in authoritarian situations as well as in democratic situations?

Does authority in final analysis come to rest upon force or compulsion?

What part does the authority of conservatism play in the functioning of social institutions?

Is authority essentially psychological?

Is authority weakened or strengthened when enforcement is required? Does the need for enforcement indicate weakness of the authority?

Can authority attach to a position and not to the person holding the position?

I

To the administrator, authority may appear to be a kind of go-no-go gauge affecting his and others' decisions and actions. The board, holder of the fundamental authority in the organization and repository of legal authority granted to the organization by the state, invests the administrator with power to act in the name of the board and under board policy and surveillance. He is empowered to conduct the enterprise as he finds necessary and possible within the definition of his authority, that is to say, within the limits of what he *must* or *may* do by virtue of the directions he

receives from the board. If asked, he would probably say that the seat of final authority in the organization was in the board and that he himself was at the point of highest authority short of that of the board. Under this concept, the *authoritativeness* of any of his acts or decisions is to be determined solely by reference to the administrator's board-given authority and to the fact of the act or decision being within the scope of that authority. It would appear that, theoretically at least, no act or decision of the administrator could be challenged, frustrated, or altered except by the board. Under the top administrator, the pyramid of line organization is developed with the lines of command clearly to be distinguished. His will is the will of the organization. Authority flows downward through formal channels of communication. Reports move upward through the same channels. Direction is downward; reference is upward. The authority structure in these terms is engagingly simple. It appears in the line-and-staff military or business organization and in the organizations of some school systems.

But, as any experienced administrator knows, such a concept of the authority structure of an organization is deceptive. It is an oversimplification of the pressures and counter-pressures to be found wherever people engage together in an enterprise. Rather than this straightforward and essentially simple condition of authority, there plays upon the administrator a complex of authorities in which what he may have considered his *power* to act is in fact a *compulsion* to act in response to pressures of many kinds. His board-given authority becomes in practice license to act within limits in response to the many influences which bear upon each administrative situation.

He finds, for example, that his authority to direct, command, or compel the services of persons within the organization requires their acceptance of his leadership, their permission for him to assume the role of director of their efforts. Students of business organization have said that somewhere in the organization there must be the point of final authority; they dramatize the condition

they desire by a diagram showing a power structure in the form of a pyramid with, usually, some individual position designated as the topmost seat of authority. But the pyramid of authority does not stand up well against analysis. Within the organization, authority is of many kinds and is widely distributed. The president says that such and such shall be so and the wheels begin to turn and each worker bends to his task. But the president's authority rests upon the acceptance of his authority, and the lowliest millhand may subvert the will of the president in the area of the millhand's action, for he may choose (1) not to serve to the fullest, (2) to serve as much as he chooses under the circumstances which attend, (3) to be insubordinate overtly or covertly to the extent that his actions escape the president's observation or knowledge, or (4) to make in the area of his work modifications of the procedures established as official within the organization. The president may not have recourse despite his power to hire and to fire because the exercise of hire-and-fire does not in itself correct the situation in which authority was defied.

The administrator, dependent upon others for the success of his undertaking, finds that their will to perform well is more significant to the outcome than his will that they perform well. His authority as administrator derives both from the board and from those whose work he is to direct. His wishing and commanding are useful to the end of securing good performance only as long as those he directs accept that objective as their objective. It is little wonder that employers so generally have become concerned about employee morale and welfare, devise recreation plans, provide cafeteria and rest services, set up hospitalization and retirement plans, and promote in many ways the concept of the organization's being one family to which workers and administrators belong in happy relationship.

If the administrator fails to lead his organization in such a way that the persons within *want* to act toward the goals of the organization in some manner or other, the organization will fail and he

will fail as the top administrator. If he tries compulsion and force to get persons to act in the way he would have them act, he will find that his effort is uneconomical because of its need to be constantly applied in order to keep the organization in action and eventually self-defeating because of counter-pressures which develop within the groups under compulsion. Even as he accepts the idea of authority being delegated to him by the board so he must accept the idea of authority being delegated to him by those whom he would lead.

In the sense in which we have been speaking, there are many authorities bearing upon the situation in which the administrator is working. From those many authorities, the administrator draws that authority which he may exercise. In response to many authorities, decisions are made and actions taken. The pressures which are exerted come from persons, from social groups, from the physical and psychological environment of the administrative situation. The pressures derive from custom and tradition, the attitudes of people within and without the organization, the needs and wants of society. The administrator finds that his acts and decisions are determined in large measure by the pressing necessity of adaptation to the environment, to the persons through whom he must work to gain his ends, to the instruments and agencies which he must employ, to the particular situation in all its aspects. Decisions and actions taken within the scope of the board-given authority and appearing as right in relation to it may be quite wrong in relation to the larger authority situation. The experienced administrator acknowledges this and often refrains from exercising the power which is his under board authority because he recognizes that factors other than that of board authority press upon the situation and dictate a different course.

Apart from the physical limitations and advantages which may be present in the school situation, the administrator of the school system will be subject to the authority, as the term is employed here, of many factors in the school-community matrix.

1. The board of education is a principal conditioning body of administrative decision and action. Through policy, formally and informally established, the board holds control over the administrator's activity and at the same time delegates to him authority which he may use in meeting his assigned responsibilities.

2. The instructional staff, through which the administrator must work to accomplish the purposes of the school system, applies subtle or obvious sanctions against the administrator's activity. His authority as titular leader of the schools will not be challenged because the authority is thought attached to the position not to the person. But in order that his leadership may be effective, he must secure his authority in the teaching group by grant of authority from it. The authority of the group is therefore the source of the authority which gives him the role of leader in fact as well as in name. Should he fail to win his place in the group, to the extent that he fails, the group will subvert his will that they perform in the direction of the ends which he holds as ends for the school organization.

3. The non-instructional staff, clerks, bus drivers, custodians, and others, if cooperating fully with the general school effort can assist greatly in the accomplishment of school tasks and the cooperation of the non-instructional staff is desirably to be won by the administrator. If the non-instructional staff is uncooperative or even opposed in its actions to the general school effort, it exercises a negative authority affecting administrative decision and action. Because non-instructional personnel are usually free from the restraints on behavior placed by professional membership, they may in fact exercise a negative authority greater than one who is not an administrator would expect. The superintendent of schools in a small community may, for example, view certain desirable school activities as being impossible of accomplishment because of the difficulties to be encountered with the custodial staff should the activities interfere with routine operation or maintenance. On the other hand, enlistment of the willing service of the custodial staff

in special activities may secure the conditions necessary to the carrying on of the activities. In connection with the non-instructional staff as with the instructional staff, the authority of the administrator depends in great measure upon his winning a place of leadership in the group.

4. The parents of the children in the schools exert both friendly and unfriendly pressures upon the administrator and he cannot escape their influence upon his decisions and actions. In general, he will attempt to secure their approval and understanding and to forestall their disapproval and protests.

5. The children in the schools exercise an influence upon the administrator's activity in several ways, most of which are desirable but some of which are potentially undesirable. He must win their cooperation also because without it some of the objectives of the school system will obviously be defeated. Happily, most of the time he can anticipate that non-cooperation will be absent. Occasionally, however, he may experience such protests of administrative action as student strikes and indignation meetings. At other times, he may find general misbehavior and misconduct against the good order of the school system.

6. All the people of the school district exercise their authority at times of school elections and at all other times through the sensitivity of the administrator and the school board to public opinion in the community. As representatives of the people of the district, the school board members express the authority of this group in the affairs of the school district. The authority, it can be recognized, is exerted both directly and indirectly upon the administrator but in each case significantly to the carrying on of public education in the district.

7. The state school law is authority which the school administrator must acknowledge as basic to public education, and as a primary conditioner of his activity.

8. The customs and traditions of society, with particular reference to the local community, control much administrative be-

havior. It is authority which ordinarily is not to be challenged with impunity. In introducing changes in school practice, the administrator must move with care in those matters which seem to be rooted deeply in community life.

9. The educational profession exerts an authority over school practice and administrative activity. Professional opinion, widely held, is apt to influence the administrator more than lay opinion, locally held, even if the latter results in considerable pressure upon the schools. The school activity is likely to reveal in every area the attention paid to what is thought to be professionally approved.

There is a twofold relationship between the administrator and the factors of authority which impinge upon his activity. In the first place, he is constrained by their influence upon the situation in which he is working at the time. He is not free to act as he might were he accountable to the board alone. In the second place, from each factor he derives authority and impulse to act in accord with the influence of that factor. Where conflict exists between authority factors affecting the situation, he must determine a course that takes all factors into account but does not immediately satisfy all of them. If no conflict exists, the situation may well determine the decision or action unless he himself offers a contrary influence. Since he should not be a neutral figure in the situation, responsive idly to pressures playing upon him, the administrator may consider himself together with his philosophy of education as an authoritative factor also. The administrator is the focus of many authorities playing roles in the governance of his decisions and actions. His leadership is tested in his turning the forces which act upon him and through him toward the accomplishment of the purposes of the public school system which he leads.

II

Although *authority* and *power* are not synonymous, many writers use the first as including the second.

Authority is like a red thread running through the whole pattern of organization. Its delegation, release, and exercise are governed by the ultimate source of the authority, because the primary purpose or objective of the association is determined by and from this ultimate source. Authority has been defined as the right of decision. It carries with it the concomitant duty to answer for the decisions made and the commands consequently given to the source from which the authority flows.

Authority may be derived from many different sources. It is not unique with ownership. It may derive from

1. Force (conquest)
2. Custom, usage, or law
3. Inheritance
4. Purchase
5. Fear
6. Election
7. Appointment.

Force means demanded obedience with the alternative of punishment. Punishment may vary from mild disapproval and the withholding of certain benefits to a sentence of death. Authority is just as real, in fact more obvious, if it is derived from force. When the Romans conquered a nation, they put Roman law into effect and the various officials derived their power from Rome and from conquest. This concept provided an interesting side light on the use of the word "right." Force provides the right of authority, and there is no moral connotation involved. The right exists whether it is sanctioned by moral law or not.

Authority may derive from custom or usage. There is an example of this in Kipling's story "Puck of Pook's Hill." Although the Normans conquered Saxon England, they in turn yielded to the authority of Saxon custom. It is probable that custom eventually crystallized into common law. It may be considered, perhaps, an impersonalized authority. The authority of the Church belongs under this heading. The priest has the authority to do certain things by custom and usage and other things by canon, or indeed, civil law. Such authority is also derived from fear. Originally, no doubt, there was actual fear of excommunica-

tion or fear of refusal of the Sacraments. Today that fear may be less physical and less recognized, but it is nonetheless real.

The authority of a parent is derived largely from custom or usage. However, it has some origin in ownership, for in many countries to this day the parent legally has all rights (except perhaps life and death) over his children. In many cases he has similar power over his wife. In almost every society, the elders have a definite authority resulting from their age and supposed wisdom. In some societies this authority has been very real, but usually it has been an ultimate authority that did not appear except in cases of emergency.

Authority derived from inheritance is a natural concept. In the old days, kings inherited their authority. This idea was carried down through the whole social system. Thus the eldest son had rather complete authority over the whole family and primogeniture was recognized as the structure of society.

Examples of authority derived by purchase are also to be found. In most cases, however, it cannot be considered a primary derivation. The Hessian soldiers in this country during the Revolutionary War owed allegiance to their Elector. He sold their services to the British, and hence the authority over them was purchased. In the colonial days men and women sold authority over themselves for definite periods of time in exchange for the payment of their transport costs to America. Numerous parallel examples from industry may be adduced. For example, a company owning a power plant may rent it to another company. Hence authority over the use of that plant will pass by hire, a form of purchase. The collection of French taxes was sold in the old days to the highest bidder. Examples could be multiplied. A primary right must exist, however. Therefore, only in the case of a person's selling rights over himself can it truly be said that authority primarily derives from purchase.

One very important derivation of authority is by election, the usual methods of governments. A president or other officeholder is elected by the voters who hold the right of franchise, which may be derived from ownership or membership. Many people think that ownership is more important than membership. Thus in many cases, both present and historical, ownership has been a prerequisite to the right to vote. However, the membership qualification is as old as and perhaps older than

the ownership qualification. It is to be noted that there are two distinct points of view. The method usually held in business corporations makes the voting power proportional to ownership so that the holder of $1,000 worth of securities with voting privileges has ten times the voting power of the holder of $100 worth. On the other hand, an equally common concept gives equal voting power to all members. This idea is used in cooperative enterprises but is not common in organizations primarily seeking a profit. Authority derived from elections implies proportionate responsibility to those who cast votes. The greater the number and the smaller the individual holdings from whom the authority is derived, the less the specific responsibility and the greater the difficulty of control.

Where authority is derived from appointment, responsibility is to the person making the appointment. Such appointments are in the nature of an agency. Thus the appointer must have the original authority and delegates to his appointee certain authority and certain responsibility. While exercising this authority, the appointee is an agent of the appointer.

While authority springs from ownership, its rights are determined by the rights of ownership, and the goals pursued will be the objectives of ownership. However, the authority does not extend over anything that the right of ownership does not comprehend. When authority is delegated, there must be a corresponding allocation of responsibility, that is, of accountability to the person or group from which the authority is received. Any authority, including the primary one, carries a twofold responsibility. As has been mentioned, the agent has an upward responsibility or accountability to the source of authority. Perhaps even more important in the long run, he has a responsibility for the person or things over which there is authority, no matter how that authority was obtained.

Ultimately the State owes a responsibility to its citizens from whom its authority flows. As its authority becomes greater, so, too, does its responsibility. In the case of an industrial organization, the responsibility downward is nonetheless real though the authority does not flow directly or obviously upward. However indirect, the rights of ownership and particularly ownership of the tools of production flow from the people as a whole. Although those over whom authority is exercised

may not have directly or even consciously granted the rights that ownership exercises and although they are but a small proportion of the whole people, yet they are a part of that whole which granted the right. In consequence, those who exercise authority must assume a responsibility for those who have made that authority possible.[1]

In a democracy, authority and power lie in the group which, while granting individuals positions of authority through appointment or election and permitting them to exercise power while in those positions, may turn them out of office periodically and invest others with the authority and power of office. The definition of authority can be quite clear in the legal acts which create offices. The amount of power which each officeholder can bring to bear will vary considerably according to his personality, the willingness of others to be influenced by holders of office, and the situation which prevails. But without authority residing variously in individuals or offices in a group organization, group activity would be impossible.

As coordination is the all-inclusive principle of organization, it must have its own principle and foundation in *authority,* or the supreme coordinating power. Always, in every form of organization, this supreme authority must rest somewhere, else there would be no directive for any coordinated effort.

The term "authority," as here used, need not imply autocracy. Where true democracy prevails, this authority rests with the group as a whole, as it rests in our government with the people of the United States. In the simplest and most compact forms of democratic organization it is represented in the entire group, assembled at one time, in one place. Examples in secular government are separated as widely in time as the ecclesia of ancient Athens and the present New England town meeting.

In whatever form it may appear, this supreme coordinating authority must be conceived simply as the source of all coordination, and not

[1] By permission from *The Engineering of Organization and Management* by Robert T. Livingston. Copyright, 1949. McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc. Pp. 89–92.

necessarily as the coordinating directive that runs through the entire organization. In a democracy like our own this authority rests with the people, who exercise it through the leaders of their choice.

The distinction between authority and leadership is such a vital one that it will in due course be considered at greater length. It is sufficient here to observe that the supreme coordinating authority must be prior to leadership in logical order, for it is this coordinating force that makes the organization. Leadership, on the other hand, always presupposes the organization. There can be no leader without something to lead. Leadership, of course, must exercise a derived authority. In absolutist forms of government the supreme coordinating authority usually exercises its own leadership, but this fact does not alter their essential difference.

Just as vital as the distinction between authority and leadership is that between authority and power, two terms so often confused. Power in the psychic sense—that is, ability to do things—is distinctly an individual possession. When we speak of the power of an organization we mean that this power has become collective through coordinated effort.

Authority, on the other hand, is a right. Hence we use the expression "moral authority," and may say of some great teacher, as was said of Jesus, the greatest of all teachers, that he speaks "as one having authority," which means that he has a moral right to speak as he does. In organization, authority is likewise a right, because it inheres legitimately in the structure of the organization. The distinction in the political sphere between de jure and de facto governments is based on the difference between the right of authority, acquired through some procedure recognized as legitimate, and the mere possession of power, however obtained.

The same observations apply to the exercise of authority, a truth that is not altered by the fact that authority rests on *moral right.* Rights cannot be divorced from duties, and if authority does not use its rights with due solicitude relative to these duties, it is sooner or later bound to fall. No organization has any prospect of stability if moral factors are not its basis.[2]

[2] James D. Mooney, *The Principles of Organization,* Harper & Brothers, New York, 1939, pp. 6–8.

Authority is inherent in group structures and is evident in leader-follower relationships, social distance, group associations with other groups, social integration-disintegration and other concerns of the sociologist and social psychologist.

Authority takes a multitude of forms and inheres in all organization. In its crudest and least socialized forms it rests merely on the power of enforcement. This is the authority of the master over the slave, of the despot over the subject, of the magistrate over the criminal—and, we may add, frequently that of the employer over the employee, though the enforcement belongs to a different order. Here authority may depend solely on the sanction which it controls. But nearly all forms of authority involve more than this, an attitude of responsiveness and of deference, an admission of subordination on the part of the subject which in turn helps to create as well as to justify the authority itself. The grounds of this voluntary subordination are diverse. Acceptance of authority may be the tribute paid to age or to wealth. It may be based mainly on the mere recognition that authority is necessary if the tasks of the everyday life are to be effectively performed or the greater order to which our lives are bound is to endure.

> Take but degree away, untune that string,
> And hark, what discord follows!

It reflects the respect for order or station or class, conveyed to the holder or representative of it. Authority may appear as the personal embodiment of position, just as the majesty of kingship is personalized in a king, apart from whatever attributes of his own he may possess. Tradition and religion may weave a spell about the person who upholds the order to which they belong. More self-interested motives also play their part, and submission is fostered by the anticipation of the rewards which the authority can bestow on his friends and followers.

Personal leadership, on the other hand, depends on the prowess, reputation, skill, oratory, or other attributes of the leader. He may be on the side of established authority or he may be opposed to it, seeking to create a new type of authority. He may stand for a definite policy or set of principles or he may be an opportunist, like a Tammany leader or

the leaders of political parties in certain politically undeveloped countries where parties are named after the leaders they follow and not after the principles they profess. He may be blindly followed, or he may depend on his power to rally men to the banner of some cause. He may be little more than the delegate or simply the mouthpiece of some interest-group, though at this point leadership is near the vanishing point. Leadership in some degree and form is present wherever men assemble. The German sociologist Simmel calls the relation between leaders and followers the most important of all social relationships. When the leader acts within the established system he adds to authority a new appeal; he interprets it afresh and gives it new vitality. And when an established system breaks it is always because a leader organizes the forces of dissatisfaction and gives them unity and direction.[3]

To say that authority is assigned to an individual or to a position which the individual holds is to say that there is belief that the individual has *power* to lay against situational factors. However, despite the common acceptance of authority and power being inseparable, it is clear that in some cases an individual may have acknowledged authority but be without effective power, the exercise of authority. A policeman may singlehandedly confront a football crowd intent upon tearing down the goalposts after a victory. No one may question his authority but all may doubt his power to meet the situation which confronts him. Against his authority as a peace officer are the facts of the impossibility of taking all the miscreants into custody, the public opinion against disciplining the victory celebrants, his own fear that his failure to exercise effective power will cause him public humiliation, and the possibility that a relatively good-natured crowd might be turned into an angry mob should its intent be thwarted.

Although a superintendent of schools might not find himself in such a dramatic role as that of the lone policeman, the superintendent of schools may often find himself without effective power

[3] R. M. MacIver, *Society, A Textbook of Sociology,* Rinehart & Company, Inc., New York, 1937, pp. 337–338.

in situations in which his authority is unquestioned. Even the power which he could bring to bear upon a given situation he may restrain in deference to expediency, prudence, and often his desire to treat others well or keep their good opinion.

Roy W. Bixler[4] has used the phrase "authority of the situation" to indicate that authority is not necessarily resident in individuals or positions but may be evidenced by the control exercised by impinging facts upon decision and other behavior. This is to say that sometimes circumstances dictate and in that way exercise authority over action. Sears discusses *control* as effective power and as evaluation which, to the extent that it affects action is of course a kind of effective power. In that sense, it is a situational factor attesting to the authority of the situation of which Bixler speaks. Sears' comments are applicable to many administrative conditions, not alone to those in school administration.

1. Control as a function of management may be thought of in two ways: (a) As the exercise of power to restrain or to direct or to determine what may happen in a given case. (b) As a basis by which one may evaluate the merit of something, or judge the implications of some action or facts or principle or signs or conditions if applied in another situation. Both of these meanings are useful in a study of the nature of the administrative process.

2. Four separate aspects of control can be used as approaches to the study of control. These include study of the power that effects it, of the device through which the power is applied, of the process of applying the power, and of the end or purpose with reference to which control is sought.

3. Control can be effected, in either a general or a technical sense, by use of any of four forms of authority; authority of law; authority of knowledge; authority of social usage, or authority of personal attitude, habit, or will.

4. Power of any sort can be applied to work only if it is channeled effectively to the work. To accomplish this, devices have to be formed.

[4] Roy W. Bixler and Genevieve K. Bixler, *Administration for Nursing Education,* G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York, 1954, p. 29.

A control device has to be suited to the purpose of control, to the nature of the work in which control is needed, to the kind of power best suited to the work, and to the process or form of activity by which power is to be directed upon the work.

5. The process of controlling may be personal and, so, subject to the will of an individual; or impersonal, subject to facts or conditions or forces that operate automatically by virtue of their existence.

6. The end or purpose of control must guide in the choice of power and of the device for applying the power.

7. Control by law may be general or specific. The more general it is, the more room it leaves for control by persons. For deciding technical matters, when action must be based upon specific facts and circumstances, the law must be general, leaving refinements to persons who can know and decide in light of the facts of the case. Control by law may be *general,* establishing rights and duties, or things to do or not do; or it may be *technical,* in the sense of providing a basis against which performance is judged or future action is guided.

8. Knowledge effects control by providing facts and meanings by which reason can calculate outcomes of possible action. Knowledge may be easily available in some cases; but it may have to be gathered by difficult and laborious effort, in others. Officers are likely to be controlled by the knowledge; although, when the opposite is true, the officer may be controlled by other more personal interests. As in the case of law, control by knowledge can be dodged in some cases.

9. Social and professional standards effect control in many matters, quite as effectively as do law and knowledge. One is judged by his conduct; knowing this, one acts in conformity with established norms. One conforms to propriety, partly because it is a matter of self-respect, of being comfortable and natural, of receiving social recognition as a person of culture; partly, too, from fear of receiving social disapproval.

10. Personal attitudes and habits, character and intelligence, and personality—the self—have drives from within that effect dependable controls. In this, people vary, to be sure, but there is something rather constant and stable about the values by which men conduct themselves—especially men who have risen to positions in the teaching profession. We count on this power and we judge our fellows by the standards they seem to live up to.

11. These four forms of power seldom operate singly to effect what we call technical control. Usually, two or more of the forms will be involved in any case. In such cases, administration should know what part each form is playing and make sure that the control, or controls, he depends upon are the ones that relate to his purposes and to the nature of the work.

12. Special devices are needed, in order to channel power to work. These devices are technical tools. As in carpentry or surgery, the tool must be designed to suit the process of conveying energy to work and for applying the energy in a way to perform the work without damage or undue labor.

13. Examination of a considerable number of such devices revealed that, because of its variety, educational work requires a large number of them; that, in the main, they are highly specialized in terms of purpose, the persons or kinds of things they control, the process of applying them, and the form of power they are to apply; that many of them are designed as much for use in direction or coordination or planning or organization as they are for use as controls.[5]

Holden, Fish, and Smith treat the matter of control by relating it to the problem of efficient delegation of authority.

One of the most challenging problems of management is to give authority to those capable of exercising it and yet retain control in the hands of those ultimately responsible. If management is to function effectively, devoting its major attention to planning, directing, and coordinating activities, it must be freed at every level of the unnecessary burden of detail.

This burden is generally associated with approvals; it is lightened to the degree that authority for final approval is delegated to others. Usually it is not from choice that executives become buried in detail; they are more often the victims of an inadequate system of control. They cannot safely delegate the authority reposed in them because there is no adequate means of control which permits this to be done.

The obvious remedy for this situation is the installation of procedures and limits designed to control the use of delegated authority. A logical

[5] By permission from *The Nature of the Administrative Process* by Jesse B. Sears. Copyright, 1950. McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc. Pp. 243–246.

place to start is with any feature which is particularly bothersome and takes considerable time. It may be approving salary increases, authorizing capital expenditures, or any one of the recurring items which require executive attention. Many such problems are company-wide in scope, and a good control procedure would lighten the burden on not only one, but many executives.

Control is a basic process and whatever the type or whatever the subject it embraces the following elements:

1. Objective—what is desired
2. Procedure
   (a) Plan—how and when it is to be done
   (b) Organization—who is responsible
   (c) Standards—what constitutes good performance
3. Appraisal—how well it was done

Conceiving the control required is the first requisite to its attainment. This involves the determination of the objective, i.e., the final results wanted, and then the careful development of a procedure which will bring about those results.

Such a procedure may require changes in the plan of organization, additions of staff groups or committees to serve as control agencies, and numerous other adjustments. This development work is not a one-man affair. The best talent and thinking on the subject available in the organization should be enlisted to help design the procedure. A careful firsthand inspection and analysis by competent people is usually an essential preliminary step to determining what the procedure should be. After the planning is done and the design is complete, each of the parts must be assigned to individuals for accomplishment. Concurrent with development of procedure is the establishment of standards of performance, which indicate for each separate part of the procedure what constitutes good performance and how it is to be measured. The procedure and the results expected must be made known to all those who are affected. Authority is then safely delegated downward in the organization, in accordance with the limits specified and subject to the control procedure.

The final aspect of control is checking to make certain that the pro-

cedure is working as intended and bringing about the results desired. The necessity for current approval is limited to those exceptional cases which are not covered by the procedure. Executive attention needs to be devoted only to those matters where performance fails to meet expectancy. Supervision becomes more effective through following results and instituting action toward correction and betterment where needed. As the control procedure becomes well established, those who are responsible may check their own performance and report causes for unsatisfactory conditions, together with the steps planned or already taken to correct them.

One by one this treatment can be extended to the recurring items requiring executive authorization. The sections which follow immediately are devoted to methods in use for controlling individually a number of the more important and difficult problems facing top management. Each time a well-planned control procedure is substituted for personal approvals, additional time is made available to the top executives for the far more important over-all planning and control of the enterprise, which is aimed at securing maximum effectiveness of the company as a whole, rather than control of any individual problem.[6]

In the delegation of authority, the administrator does not lessen his own authority but rather places it in relationship to other persons so that, presumably, it can be used effectively. He retains his power while attaching authority to someone else who may consequently also exercise effective power in situations covered by the authority given him. If the delegation is badly done, the person to whom authority is attached may not have effective power. If the delegation of authority is well done, the administrator has in effect extended himself and his power through the persons to whom delegation has been made.

III

In large measure, authority is a psychological concept. It has to do with the effect of one or more persons upon others and is modi-

[6] By permission from *Top-Management Organization and Control* by Paul E. Holden, Lounsbury S. Fish, and Hubert L. Smith. Copyright, 1951. McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc. Pp. 77–78.

fied by the situation in which authority is to be exercised. Authority may be given by virtue of personality. Simple social groups are so formed. Authority may be given to an individual because of social organization which provides for positions in which holders are granted authority of position.

Authority in school situations is derived from many sources but perhaps essentially from the people of a state. A single teacher in a single classroom situation has authority by virtue of (1) his status as an adult, (2) his assignment to the position of teacher, (3) his personality in relation to other personalities in the situation, (4) his representing the school system in the particular situation which prevails, (5) his derivation of authority from the school board which permits him to act in its name, (6) his being able to call upon other power wielders should his own use of power be ineffective, (7) his status as a member of the teaching profession, (8) his legal position in loco parentis, (9) tradition and custom, (10) deference paid to a person of educational attainment beyond the average of the community, (11) his ability to bring to bear effective power of some sort in the situation.

It can be noted that the teacher derives authority directly from many sources and that the superintendent of schools (presumably top school officer in a line-and-staff organization) is in only one of the channels. To illustrate: parents in effect grant authority directly to the teacher of their child; board regulations affect teachers directly in many instances, spelling out authority and responsibility; the impact of professional thinking and practice is directly upon the teacher as a member of the profession; much of state law attaches authority directly to the teacher and may even, as in some cases involving the status of *in loco parentis,* exclude administrators; and most importantly the group of children with which a teacher works in effect grants the teacher authority over their actions or withholds such grant and renders the teacher ineffective. Authority has many faces but in effect encompasses the belief that

the individual to whom authority attaches can exercise effective power in situations where the authority is relevant.

REFERENCES

ALLEN, HOLLIS P., *The Federal Government and Education,* McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., New York, 1950, chaps. 9, 11, 14.

APPLEBY, PAUL H., *Policy and Administration,* University of Alabama Press, University, Alabama, 1949, chaps. 4, 5.

BIXLER, ROY W., and BIXLER, GENEVIEVE K., *Administration for Nursing Education,* G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York, 1954, chaps. 2, 3, 4, 5, 6.

BROWN, ALVIN, *Organization A Formulation of Principle,* Hibbert Printing Company, New York, 1945, chap. 10.

BROWN, ALVIN, *Organization of Industry,* Prentice-Hall, Inc., New York, 1947, chap. 4.

DAVID, RALPH C., *The Fundamentals of Top Management,* Harper & Brothers, New York, 1951, chaps. 8, 9.

DIMOCK, MARSHALL E., *The Executive in Action,* Harper & Brothers, New York, 1945, chaps. 18, 19.

DUBIN, ROBERT, *Human Relations in Administration,* Prentice-Hall, Inc., New York, 1951, chaps. 11, 12, 13, 14, 16, 17.

FAYOL, HENRI, *General and Industrial Management,* Sir Isaac Pitman & Sons, Ltd., London, 1949, chaps. 4, 5.

GARDNER, BURLEIGH B., and MOORE, DAVID G., *Human Relations in Industry,* rev. ed., Richard D. Irwin, Inc., Chicago, 1950, chaps. 3, 6.

GAUS, JOHN MERRIMAN, *Reflections on Public Administration,* University of Alabama Press, University, Alabama, 1947, chap. 5.

GULICK, LUTHER, and URWICK, L. (editors), *Papers on the Science of Administration,* Institute of Public Administration, New York, 1937, chap. 9.

HARRELL, THOMAS WILLARD, *Industrial Psychology,* Rinehart & Company, Inc., New York, 1949, chap. 16.

HOLDEN, PAUL E., FISH, LOUNSBERRY S., and SMITH, HUBERT L., *Top-Management Organization and Control,* McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., New York, 1951, part C.

HYNEMAN, CHARLES S., *Bureaucracy in a Democracy,* Harper & Brothers, New York, 1950, chap. 3.

LEPAWSKY, ALBERT, *Administration,* Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., New York, 1949, chap. 11.

LIVINGSTON, ROBERT T., *The Engineering of Organization and Management,* McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., New York, 1949, chap. 6.

MACIVER, R. M. *The Web of Government,* The Macmillan Company, New York, 1947, chaps. 3, 5.

MILWARD, G. E., *An Approach to Management,* Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1947, part II.

MOONEY, JAMES D., *The Principles of Organization,* rev. ed., Harper & Brothers, New York, 1947, chaps. 1, 3.

MORT, PAUL R., *Principles of School Administration,* McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., New York, 1946, part II.

NEWMAN, WILLIAM H., *Business Policies and Management,* 2d ed., South-Western Publishing Company, Cincinnati, 1947, chap. 19.

ROETHLISBERGER, F. J., *Management and Morale,* Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1950, chap. 3.

SEARS, JESSE B., *The Nature of the Administrative Process,* McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., New York, 1950, chaps. 6, 7, 8, 10, 11.

SIMON, HERBERT A., *Administrative Behavior,* The Macmillan Company, New York, 1947, chaps. 1, 7.

URWICK, L., *The Elements of Administration,* Harper & Brothers, New York, 1943, chaps. 4, 5, 7.

CHAPTER VI

The Factor of Group Interaction in Administration

What motivates individuals to participate in groups? Does group membership retard or encourage individualism?

How can groups be encouraged to work democratically if some individuals in the group seek to pervert the process for their own purposes?

Is a democratic group more or less efficient than an authoritarian-led group?

By what methods does a group facilitate or thwart the decision-making process? Is it possible for groups to arrive at decisions and then carry out the decisions?

Is it possible for an administrator to relinquish his responsibility to a group? Can authority be commensurate with this responsibility?

Is it possible for non-managerial employees in an organization to grasp the problems of management? What methods can be used to facilitate understanding?

I

As the present century unfolds it becomes increasingly apparent that the "rugged individualist" of the nineteenth century is giving way to the "group thinker." This phenomenon has permeated all fields of endeavor and has a language characteristic of its disciples. While the phraseology is distinctive for each field—group dynamics, social physics, social action, communication engineering, group

integration—the ideas are similar. The voluminous literature appearing in the area of group interaction; the research completed, underway, or conceived; and the implementation of the concept by educators, government officials, businessmen, industrialists, and military planners offers ample testimony to its vitality.

Some of the basic premises of the concept of group interaction appear to be as follows:

1. Individuals are important.
2. Individuals are members of many and varied groups.
3. Groups strongly influence the individual.
4. Individuals take on the characteristics of the group and the group is a composite of all the individuals who are its members.
5. Groups are organized or unorganized, formal or informal.
6. Groups are capable of reaching and implementing decisions.
7. Group thinking can be more effective than individual thinking.
8. Groups are motivated by the self-interests of their members.
9. Groups are conditioned by the situations in which they operate.

From these, as well as related premises, efforts have been made to advance a theory of action that describes all social behavior. These suppositions have also been incorporated into the concept described as "human relations in administration."

Individuals and not groups must in a democracy be considered as the fundamental unit of that society. The individual has to be thought of as a creative unit who participates in or belongs to a number of groups. Membership in the group is conceived of as a means by which the creativity of the individual is enhanced rather than submerged. In a totalitarian society the individual personality is repressed instead of expressed. This principal dissimilarity between democratic and totalitarian philosophies demands that the primacy of the individual over the group be recognized in theory as well as practice.

A group, as defined in this concept, is not just a collection of individuals A and B and C and D, rather it is A in his relationships

to B, C, and D; B in his relationships to A, C, and D; C in his relationships to A, B, and D; and D in his relationships to A, B, and C. A collection of twenty-five individuals riding on a public conveyance does not constitute a group unless some circumstance ensues which unifies them. Individuals in a group are joined either by purpose, necessity, problem, routine, tradition, or organization. There is recognition by its members that a condition exists.

The individual seeks membership in groups to satisfy certain psychological needs that cannot be secured by the individual living alone. Since most men do not choose to live alone, the significance of group identification cannot be overestimated. From group affiliation individuals seek recognition, belongingness, security, authority, understanding, and power. It is generally agreed that individuals require more than economic security if they are to produce at an acceptable level of efficiency. Labor union growth is symbolic of this quest. People are not only motivated to join labor unions by the promise of higher wages and improved working conditions but also by the desire to be recognized as important human beings.

Individuals associate themselves with many groups—family, friends, church, school, neighborhood, lodge, business, labor—and their actions and attitudes are conditioned by these affiliations. Self-identification with a group, however, does not reveal the intensity of feeling for a group. When conflict is nonexistent among the groups to which the individual gives allegiance, then there is a state of equilibrium and intensity of feeling is relatively unimportant. Should conflict occur, then self-interest, group solidarity, and group loyalty manifest themselves, and the extent to which the individual aligns himself with certain groups is evident. Teachers consider themselves members of a school system and they share the burden of administrative responsibility. Should an issue be focused on a problem of teacher-personnel relations, however, they are then disposed to identify themselves as members of the teaching staff rather than of an administrative staff. Multiplicity of group

membership accompanied by varying degrees of self-identification create many maladjustments in organizational behavior.

In organizations the existence of certain groups is predetermined by the formally constituted structure. Within a single school building there are at least four distinct employee groups—administrators, teachers, clerical staff, and maintenance personnel. If the school is large enough, there will undoubtedly be subdivisions of the principal groups. Place the single school in a school system and the groups seem to multiply almost as by a process of arithmetic progression. Each group appears to have its proper niche in the organizational hierarchy and an appropriate set of status symbols to distinguish it from other groups. The individual in becoming a member of an organization accepts a position that makes him a member of certain specified groups.

Informal, often unorganized, groups are created as a result of the contacts made necessary in executing daily routine. If the principal, the mathematics teacher, the basketball coach, the journalism instructor, and the chief engineer generally eat lunch together they often constitute an informal "inner council." If the kindergarten teacher, the clerk, the art teacher, and the third grade teacher belong to the same church they will often represent another type of informal school group. These groups, informal and unofficial, represent an essential part of the organizational structure, for it is often through them that decisions are tested and ideas developed, and it is often because of them that progress is thwarted.

Whether groups in an organization are formal or informal, organized or unorganized, the administrator needs to be cognizant of their position in the organization, the pressures they exert upon individuals, and the advantages to be accrued by their proper use. Understanding and effectiveness in an organization is most satisfactorily obtained when the groups have had the opportunity to participate in the decision-making process. Having had the opportunity to make decisions the groups can then properly assist in the interpretation and implementation aspects of management.

Where the organization is large the usual means by which groups find expression is through the creation of representative committees. The mere act of committee creation does not, however, insure coordination of group effort. Individuals on committees must represent the members of their groups and they must be able to correctly interpret its mood. In order for committees to operate competently there must be an atmosphere of mutual trust and respect. Committees should come into being only as a real need for them exists and they should give way to other committees as the initial need is alleviated. The committee is not an end in itself but the means whereby the group forces in an organization are brought into harmony.

In a democratic social order the action engendered by group interaction is not to be considered a symptom of chaos but as a measure of the strength of the system. The force of individual upon individual, individual upon group, group upon individual, and group upon group is the means by which democracy is stimulated. To make the process sterile under the guise of unity or control is to deny the very existence of the concept of democracy. The administrator needs to be able to understand individuals and groups and the role they play in organizations, appreciate the contributions they make, and provide the opportunity for constructive use of their energy, talent, and intelligence.

II

Group dynamics, the study of human behavior as it functions in groups, is a relatively young branch of the social sciences, although the literature about groups goes back into the distant past. The impetus for research in this field is the resultant of domestic and international crises and the individual efforts of many persons. Political scientists, social psychologists, labor union leaders, personnel directors, sociologists, and educators have engaged in efforts to strengthen the democratic way of life in the armed forces, schools, communities, business concerns, and various branches of

government. It has become increasingly apparent that democracy to survive must be lived by the people of the nation in their various associations. To understand the functioning of groups needs to be a primary responsibility of the executive, whether in schools, business, or government. Cartwright and Zander emphasize that the health of a democratic society is dependent upon the effectiveness of its groups and that it is possible to improve group life through scientific methods.

Although man was slow in demanding that his working assumptions about the nature of group life be based upon objective evidence, his curiosity is no longer satisfied with speculation or the accumulated wisdom of personal experience. Today we demand facts. And, although all of us sometimes mistakenly take our untested prejudices to be facts, there is widespread recognition that a fact can be established only through careful use of objective methods of observation, measurement, and experimentation.

The use of such methods to provide a dependable body of knowledge about groups has accelerated rapidly within very recent years. The resources devoted to this end are now immeasurably greater than just a short time ago. Perhaps the most important reason for this development is the simultaneous acceptance of two propositions—that the health of democratic society is dependent upon the effectiveness of its competent groups, and that the scientific method can be employed in the task of improving group life.

A democratic society derives its strength from the effective functioning of the multitude of groups which it contains. Its most valuable resources are the groups of people found in its homes, communities, schools, churches, business concerns, union halls, and various branches of government. Now, more than ever before, it is recognized that these smaller units must perform their functions well if the larger system is to work successfully.

Awareness of the practical importance of something does not, however, lead automatically to its scientific investigation. The recent rise of research in group dynamics could occur only because people began to

see that the scientific method can be applied to these important phenomena.

The demonstration that techniques can provide dependable findings about critical social problems has resulted in a great increase in the financial resources and the number of competent investigators available for research on groups. This research is being conducted by persons trained in several disciplines and under the auspices of universities and other organizations more directly concerned with the practical problems of group life. The conclusions and theoretical interpretations of all this research are scattered throughout a variety of publications in several professional fields.[1]

The term, "group dynamics," is associated with the efforts of research workers in the fields of sociology, social psychology, and education; however, the concept is not alien to other fields. In industry, the concept of human relations finds its way into the literature on business management as well as the speeches of industrial executives. The importance of human relations in industry has been described by Livingston.

Management has been called the art of persuading other people to pursue enthusiastically your particular objective. If it is entirely an art, what place has it in engineering? Perhaps it was Niccoló Machiavelli who first considered that it might not be an art and attempted to lay down certain rules. From that time on there was gradually evolved a set of rules and principles. Now we are beginning to see that a science —the science of management—is emerging, which is not an art but an engineering problem, subject to the same methods of attack as any other engineering problem. It may even be possible to write the formulas for solution, even though they are of undetermined functional form with unknown parameters.

Everyone, consciously or unconsciously, poorly or well, of sheer necessity applies the principles of management in his everyday life. But

[1] Dorwin Cartwright and Alvin Zander, *Group Dynamics,* Row, Peterson and Company, Evanston, Illinois, 1953, pp. ix–x.

like so many everyday things, the application is often without formal thought. Hence, the full possibilities of the method are seldom appreciated because they are not considered. Most of life and most behavior obey a constant pattern. Psychologists and social scientists are beginning to discover that the behavior of individuals is not so unpredictable as was once thought. It is habitual. We may now begin to believe, therefore, that management is not an art. But in order to be sure that it becomes scientific, we must systematize our thought. Such a systematization of thought is useful because, when we clarify the fundamentals, understanding can arise and will form a basis of effective thinking and successful action.

A systematization of thought indicates the development of a philosophy. A philosophical system of management means a planned procedure of thinking, which will be coordinated and serve a definite purpose. An objective is inferred, and a planned and coordinated path for reaching that objective is inherent.

Management can never escape from the human aspect. Essentially, management deals with men and their adjustment to other men, machines, processes, materials, and methods. It is important to establish such a science, to analyze these relationships, indeed, to formulate them, even though the formulas produced will have unknown functional forms and coefficients. This unknown element is not surprising, as the material of management is man, who is not susceptible to precisely the same analysis as physical or chemical phenomena. It should not be overlooked, however, that increasingly the mechanical, the chemical, and the electrical engineer (as dealers in precision) are finding that probability and the intangibles of human idiosyncrasies are of importance in their fields.[2]

The importance of group attachment for the individual cannot be minimized. Golden and Ruttenberg claim that the growth of labor unions has been in part due to the fact that the average worker secures from union membership "a sense of belonging, of being important and useful, of being a part of a vital, virile, perma-

[2] By permission from *The Engineering of Organization and Management* by Robert Livingston. Copyright, 1949. McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc. Pp. 40–41.

nent social group—an integral part of a group that will give him a real sense of social security."

Workers organize into labor unions not alone for economic motives but also for equally compelling psychological and social ones, so that they can participate in making the decisions that vitally affect them in their work and community life.

Of the three motives for union membership—psychological, social, and economic—the latter is most commonly recognized. Workers want to improve their economic status, to secure a larger portion of the proceeds of production, and to make their lives more secure. The economic motive does not require either elaboration or illustration because it is so well known. What is necessary is a critical examination of the doctrine that the economic factors are all-dominating, even exclusive, in union-management relations.

The industrial peace of American industry has been disturbed, in large measure, because of the failure of management and, yes, many labor leaders to understand fully the several motives that impel workers to join unions of their own choosing.

To look upon industrial unrest and the formation of labor unions as springing primarily from economic factors is an oversimplification of the problems of human relations. The basic needs of the human beings who make up American industry's working force are threefold:

1. Economic—an adequate plane of living and the necessary amount of job and wage protection.
2. Psychological—the personality needs of freedom of action, self-expression, and creative outlets.
3. Social—the ties and bonds of group relations and community life.

Workers seek these three things in their jobs. When they fail to find satisfaction for all of these needs, or any one of them, in their daily work, they seek the fulfillment of the unsatisfied need or needs outside. This finds expression in many forms of individual and group activity. We are concerned solely with the manner in which workers seek a

well-rounded life through union membership, and the extent to which they find satisfaction of their threefold needs through their unions. Union membership is not an escape or a substitute satisfaction, but a means for workers to find direct satisfaction in their daily jobs for economic, psychological, and social needs.

Which is the most important motive is an academic question. The practical consideration is that all three are important; no matter why a man or woman in industry says he or she is doing a certain thing at a given time, that person is moved at the same time by psychological and social factors as well as by economic ones. All three motives are enveloped inside of human beings, are at work in varying degrees and in different ways, and are inseparable from those persons who are moved by them.

Industrial workers, particularly in the larger concerns, have experienced a similar life, in varying degrees and in different ways, ever since the rise of the huge corporate production units. Their work smothered their personalities, denied them any satisfying social security, besides failing to give them either an adequate economic return or an enduring job status. The average worker, like other folk, needs more than higher wages and job-protecting seniority rules to make him happy. He needs opportunities to satisfy his personality; outlets for his creative drives; *a sense of belonging, of being important and useful, of being a part of a vital, virile, permanent social group—an integral part of a group that will give him a real sense of social security.*

Industrial peace lies at the end of three converging paths, rather than at the end of any single one. The psychological, social, and economic needs of the human beings who make up America's working force must all be satisfied. Labor unions are indispensable in the fulfillment of these needs because they can be satisfied only through group relations. Unions are peculiarly adapted toward this end since they serve workers as a means of self-expression, as a socially integrating force, as a provider of economic benefits, and as an instrument for participation in the productive process. Management by itself, through individual relations with workers, cannot satisfy all three needs. Nor can

unions alone. The joint efforts of both are required to provide workers with a well-rounded environment, a happy prosperous, and secure life.[3]

There are many perplexing problems of human relationships that the executive faces in his efforts to achieve a coordinated, harmonious enterprise. Roethlisberger indicates the scope of some of the problems and the ways by which the administrator can study them.

The human problems of a business organization can be conceived of in a number of different ways. Customarily we think of them in terms of the development of personnel functions. (1) There are problems of employment and placement; how to select the right people and how to place them in the right jobs. (2) There are problems of training; how to instruct new workers in the techniques of their job and in their responsibilities. (3) There are problems relating to working conditions, safety, and health: how to maintain reasonable hours of work and congenial and healthful conditions of work, and how to prevent accidents and lost time due to illness. (4) There are problems relating to payment: how to pay workers adequately for the work they do. (5) There are problems relating to promotion: how to advance people in accordance with their abilities. (6) There are problems relating to the welfare of employees: how to help them in times of need and at retirement, as well as to provide recreational and social activities during their period of employment. (7) There are problems of collective bargaining: how to give employees the opportunity of saying and doing something with regard to the conditions of their employment.

There is no question that this system of classifying human problems is useful and practical for certain purposes. However, inasmuch as a great deal has already been said in terms of these functions, it might be interesting to restate the human problems of a business organization from a different point of view. The new way of classifying human problems which this point of view suggests does not supplant the former. It is merely another way of conceiving of the human problems of a business organization, which we hope to show is also useful, convenient, and practical for certain purposes.

[3] Clinton S. Golden and Harold J. Ruttenberg, *The Dynamics of Industrial Democracy,* Harper & Brothers, New York, 1942, pp. 3–22.

According to this conception, the first human problem of any business organization is *how to secure the cooperation of people in attaining its collective purpose.* Every personnel function above described is in part related to this objective. However, many of these functions are so conceived of and so stated as to be directly associated with the more technical methods of securing efficiently the economic objective of the total organization. For our purposes, we feel it is important to keep separate these two aspects of cooperative activity. By keeping clear (1) the processes required to secure the economic purposes of the business organization from (2) the processes required to secure the cooperation of people in attaining these purposes, we avoid talking at the same time about what may be two quite different things.

If the first human problem is how to secure collaboration among members of the working force, then some of the subordinate problems relating to it can be roughly divided into three groups: (1) problems relating to the channels of communication within the organization through which employees can learn about their duties and obligations in relation to the economic purpose, as well as express their feelings and sentiments about their methods and conditions of work; (2) problems of maintaining a condition of balance within the internal organization such that employees, by contributing their services, are able to satisfy their desires and hence are willing to cooperate; and (3) problems of effecting individual adjustments, whereby particular employees who are having difficulties can be assisted to become better oriented to their situations.[4]

The importance of groups to organizations and society has been underscored by specialists in a number of different fields. If the executive accepts as his responsibility an analysis of the groups within his organization then he must *know* the ways groups are structured. There are a number of characteristics that help describe the manner in which groups operate within an organization: (1) Organized groups are structures of positions which are organized to reach certain goals. (2) Organizations are characteristi-

[4] F. J. Roethlisberger, *Management and Morale,* Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1950, pp. 109–111.

cally divided into subgroups that are relatively homogeneous and tend to differ from other units. (3) Organizations exist with systems of formal and informal human relationships. (4) Individuals occupy positions in the groups within the total organization that condition their behavior patterns. (5) Positions in an organization are identified by status symbols and these symbols establish groups.

Newcomb has analyzed the generalization that within organized groups there are positions which in some way must contribute to the purposes of the group.

Sociologists and social anthropologists frequently view societies as consisting of a complex organization of positions. When he takes this point of view, the scientist disregards the particular individuals who happen to compose the society—they are incidental to him. When the people are subtracted in this particular way from a society, what is left is a great network of positions, all the elements of which are more or less related to and consistent with one another. Our society, for example, provides many different kinds of positions, such as those of father, bishop, housewife, mayor, railroad engineer, and many hundreds of others.

Every position which is recognized by the members of a group contributes in some way to the purposes of the group; this contribution represents its *function.* Associated with every position is a body of common beliefs concerning its function; these beliefs, or ideologies, to which we have already referred, represent one part of the group's system of norms. The functions of a position as understood by group members who recognize the position do not necessarily correspond to its functions as they would be seen by an outsider—by a sociologist, for example, who is especially interested in the ways in which a position contributes to group survival. But this *objective* function (i.e., the function seen by the sociologist) is dependent on some *shared assumptions* on the part of group members concerning the contribution made by the occupant of a position. Thus to certain Indian tribes of southwest regions of the United States the function of a priest may be generally accepted as that of bringing rain. As viewed by a sociologist, however, the service performed by the priest might be that of promot-

ing group solidarity. His objective function thus differs from his accepted function, but the former could not be performed without this or some other accepted function, as provided for in group norms. Positions exist, then, because they correspond to functions as commonly understood according to group norms, whether or not there is a close correspondence between "real" and commonly understood functions.

Thus the positions, which are the smallest element—the construction blocks—of societies and organized groups, are interrelated and consistent because they are organized to common ends. From one point of view, then, societies and organized groups are structures of positions which are organized to reach certain goals. Since every position is a part of an inclusive system of positions, no one position has any meaning apart from the other positions to which it is related. The position of mother cannot exist without the position of child, for example, nor that of leader without that of follower. Every position points to one or more others related to it.[5]

If a position has been created in a system that has not been recognized by the members of the organization as being essential to the achievement of purposes then the position should be abolished, or reconstituted so that it does make an essential contribution, or the value of the position should be made apparent to all.

An organizational grouping such as a school system consists of many subgroups, each of which has its own unique identity. It is even common to find subgroups in a single elementary school such as the lower unit, kindergarten through grades three, and the upper unit, grades four through six. The administrator's task is to understand the structure and functioning of such groups and to coordinate the efforts of all of the subgroups so that the organization can operate efficiently.

The most obvious fact about most groups is that they are made up of subgroups. Groups are not usually homogeneous within but are characteristically divided into parts that are relatively homogeneous and tend to differ from the other parts. Thus, the leaders and followers

[5] Theodore Newcomb, *Social Psychology,* The Dryden Press, New York, 1950, pp. 277–278.

are differentiated, and the members of a work group have different responsibilities. Often the subgrouping is not on the basis of such formal functional grounds, but on other more subtle ones. In a group discussion some people are dominant and others submissive; some coalesce into a subgroup that upholds one opinion as opposed to other subgroups that champion different opinions. The criteria for determining the existence of subgroupings are the same as those for determining the major groupings. Thus we would expect that members of a subgroup will perceive the other members of the subgroup as somewhat separated from the remaining group members, and we would expect that the amount of interaction across subgroup boundaries would tend to be less than within the subgroup.

Relationships among subgroups. Similarly, there are both horizontal and vertical relationships among subgroups. That is, some subgroups are on an equal level, having equivalent power and status; others are in a hierarchical relationship, some being superior to others, having more power and status. And both vertically and horizontally, the different subgroups vary in the closeness or remoteness of relationship to one another. In a military unit, for example, there may be a vertical differentiation into commissioned officers, noncommissioned officers, and men. The relationship between the first and third is remote, being mediated by the second. And there may also be horizontal differentiation among the men into MP's, cooks and bakers, headquarters staff, field personnel, etc. Some of these will be (and feel) more closely related than others. Thus, the MP's, for obvious reasons, may be "psychologically distant" from most of the other subgroups.

Smaller subgroups. We cannot, of course, stop with a classification of social organizations, groups, and their subgroups. To be complete, the "map" of group structure must incorporate all groupings from the largest to the very smallest. The final step is the subgrouping into units of two. Just as in all larger groupings, the groupings of two individuals may be based on many different kinds of interpersonal relations. These include such things as feelings of friendship, love, admiration, respect, identification, loyalty, cooperation as well as dislike, hatred, sadism, masochism, dominance, submission, rivalry, and just sheer indifference. It is only when we have a complete description of all the interrelationships and subgroupings within a social organization

or a psychological group that we have what is essential to a complete understanding of the structure and functioning of a group.[6]

Individuals are members of the formal organization and at the same time belong to many informal groups. Each of these relationships conditions the behavior of the individual. Using a factory as his frame of reference, Gardner has made a detailed analysis of the influence of groups upon the individual's behavior and the sociological and psychological derivations of this pressure.

In order to have an adequate understanding of the problems of industrial organization, some attention must be given to the people who work in factories, to their personal problems, desires and satisfactions as individuals. So far we have been looking at industry as a social structure, a system made up of many interrelated parts which have different positions and functions. At the same time we should not lose sight of the fact that every person working in industry has a place in this structure. In the physical layout of the factory there are machines, benches, tables, and desks, which are work positions; and on the organizational chart of a factory other kinds of positions are marked. Though neither the benches and tables nor the markings on the chart designate actual individuals, they do represent positions which are filled by people. The physical layout or the organization chart of the factory may remain stable in spite of changes in personnel, in spite of movement of the people from one position to another or out of the structure.

At any one time, then, each person has a definite position and role in relation to every other in the factory where he works. At the same time each one has a place in a number of other structures outside the factory. He is part of a family, part of a neighborhood, part of a clique, and he may be part of a lodge, a club, and a church. In each of these, as in the factory, he has a place in relation to others and can be thought of as occupying a position in a structure. In each case his position means that certain things are expected of him, so that it may be said to limit and control his behavior. As a punch press operator, for example,

[6] By permission from *Theory and Problems of Social Psychology*, by David Krech and Richard Crutchfield. Copyright, 1948. McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc. Pp. 374–375.

a person must fit into certain routines. He comes to work at certain hours; he stands at one machine all day going through certain motions; he works beside certain other people; and he takes orders from a certain foreman. At the same time, his job sets many limitations; it determines the things he cannot do; it limits his contacts and interaction in definite ways. If he is an accounting clerk, he goes through other routines; he has different sets of interaction; he has other limitations. In the same way his positions in other structures determine his activities. A boy living at home with his parents has a pattern of behavior different from that of a husband living with his wife and children.

At a glance this seems like such a simple matter that we take it for granted and often miss the significance it has for the individual. In the first place it means that no one is completely a free agent. Each is bound by his place in these structures, and to a surprisingly large extent each must fit the structure; it will not adapt itself to him. This is especially true of the factory structure which is designed, not to suit people, but to produce goods through a complex system of highly coordinated activities of both men and machines. If you operate a machine, you must adjust yourself to the needs of the machine; it will not allow of much variation. Besides this, you must adjust yourself to the co-ordinated activities of the work group, which in turn is adjusted to the activities of the department, and through it to the plant as a whole.

Since each person must adapt himself to his place in the structure, each movement within the structure means a fresh adjustment. Just as we recognize that there is a very extensive adjustment of behavior and attitudes expected of the young man who changes his role through marriage, so every change of place within the factory means readjustment. If an individual is moved from this punch press to that one, he makes only a small adaptation, yet to many workers it is important enough that they prefer to stay on the same machine.

While such movements require only slight changes in behavior or in physical activities, many other moves result in decided changes in ways of thinking and attitudes and even in the whole orientation of the individual. This is especially true of changes from one level to another in the supervisory hierarchy, such as from worker to foreman, or from department chief to division chief. If an individual moves upward in the structure, he must adjust himself to completely new activities, to new

relations with others, and to new ways of thinking. A similar shift is found with changes from one type of organization to another, such as from engineering to manufacturing or to personnel administration. The individual who moves within the structure must not only face new work problems but must learn to think properly for his new position; he must learn to think like a foreman, or a division chief, or a personnel man. This on the whole is one of the least understood aspects of the adjustment of individuals to changes in position.

The individual is not an inert plastic being forced into a social mold; he does not automatically change in conformity with each new role. Instead he has been "conditioned" by his experiences in all his different roles in all the different structures, and he brings to his job a complex pattern of behavior, attitudes, and concepts which are a result of his whole life-experience. Out of this background of experience he has developed attitudes and expectations of the job, ideas as to what is expected of him and what he can expect of others. He may have developed habitual ways of acting which are so routine that he is no longer conscious of them; and to change his role and learn new behavior and attitudes may be a slow and painful process.

Furthermore, the individual may be thought of as bringing to his job his own personal set of "demands." He is seeking certain satisfactions; he expects the job to perform certain functions for him; and he judges it constantly in terms of these demands. These expectations are another product of his conditioning; they grow out of the society itself and out of his place and experience in it. Thus the son of a banker, with a college education, has different expectations and makes different demands of his job than the son of a day laborer with a grammar-school education. These differences in expectations and demands mean a difference in the way they each look at the job, a difference in the way they react, and the meanings they attach to everything that happens in the work situation.

Looking at it this way, we can describe the well-adjusted person as one who finds some balance between the satisfactions he is seeking, between his demands and expectations, and the satisfactions which the job provides. The poorly adjusted individual is the one whose demands are much greater than the satisfactions he receives. The individual who is seeking status and recognition in the community, for example, will be

dissatisfied with a low-status job, and the person who is trying to maintain his position in a group of friends with high incomes will be dissatisfied with the pay of a semi-skilled shop job. A single girl living at home, on the other hand, may feel that a friendly work group is more important to her than high pay. Neither high wages nor good environment, however, automatically produce satisfied and well-adjusted workers. The adjustment and satisfaction of the individual on the job is not just a simple matter of wages and physical working conditions, but is an adjustment within a complex pattern.

Because the satisfactions which the individual is seeking are expressions of his past conditioning in the society and his present positions in the social structures, there are certain uniformities in attitudes and expectations among people at work. People with similar position and background or experience are apt to have similar expectations of their jobs. Thus we can make some predictions about the way an individual will react if we know something about his place in various sets of relationships. As pointed out, the son of a well-to-do professional family is not content to remain long on a low-status shop job; and when we see him in such a situation, we can expect his behavior to reflect his disturbance. This is so well known that most employment men hesitate to put such people on shop jobs except for limited periods, such as vacation employment of college students or as a training period.

The patterns of the society itself, the groupings into which people fall in their relations in the home and community, are the basis of many of their attitudes toward their jobs. Men and women, for example, have different roles in the society, and this is reflected in different attitudes toward their jobs. Patterns of behavior and attitudes vary with age, too, and with one's role in the family group, so that a boy does not have the same activities or expectations as an old man, or a young girl the same as a mother. People also fit into groups in the class system of the society on the basis of their status relationhips with others, and the members of one class or status group act and think and hope differently from members of the other groups. His place in each of these groupings, and in others, has a part in determining a person's attitudes toward his job and the satisfactions he looks for in it.

Over a period of years any one individual may be seen to change his attitudes and expectations from time to time. Many of these changes

are the result of new experiences; they are expressions of changes in his pattern of relationships, or his role in either the work group or the outside society. Some of the changes are so common to all of us that we can say that there are certain phases through which nearly everyone goes which create problems of adjustment.[7]

What of the individual? Does status and position so predetermine behavior that the individual is in reality a slave to a system? It would have to be recognized that groups impose upon the individual modes of behavior, but it must also be recognized that an individual can so function in a position as to influence the behavior of the group. It is this characteristic of a democratic group that gives democracy its vitality. The individual need not accept a stagnant role dictated by position and its accompanying status symbols, but can use his skills, abilities, and personality to give the role a new meaning. In a school system the individual can act as a creative force rather than just as a receptor of orders, decisions, and requests.

When a man takes a new job or joins a fraternity or enters a military unit, his relations to his superiors, inferiors, and associates are, to a very considerable extent, predetermined for him. How an individual behaves toward other members of the group depends partly upon the personality of the individual and partly upon the nature of the group structure and his role within that structure. Similarly, how the individual is perceived and reacted to by the others is also partly dependent upon his role.

Who fills a certain role in a group may be entirely arbitrary and may bear no relation to the personality or abilities or interests of the individual. The more rigidly established and more formal the group the more likely it is that group interaction is guided along predetermined lines and the perception of and reaction to other group members is related to the defined role rather than to the individual per se. In informal groups, on the other hand, the very absence of predetermined interpersonal relations means that the group structure depends more

[7] Burleigh B. Gardner, *Human Relations in Industry,* Richard D. Irwin, Inc., Chicago, 1945, pp. 168–172.

upon the individual characteristics of the members. In other words, in social organizations, there is a marked tendency to channel interpersonal relations along routinized lines; in psychological groups, the dynamic interactions among people have much more significance in determining the role of the individual.

But the distinction is not absolute. Even in quite rigid social organizations there is considerable latitude for individual differences within a given role. Different people placed in the same formal role may behave quite differently, as the individual differences found among second lieutenants testify. For another thing, the group as defined formally may not represent the group as it functions in reality. Thus the formal leader may be only a figurehead, the servant may rule the master, the real intercommunication within the group as defined formally may not represent the group as it functions in reality. Thus the formal leader may be only a figurehead, the servant may rule the master, the real intercommunication with the group may not travel via official channels. And even in quite informal psychological groups there is not complete spontaneity in the way the group forms and the individuals function. In the first place, the roles of members of many psychological groups are to some degree predetermined. Thus, in a given culture when a man and a woman marry and have a child, the pattern of interpersonal relations among the family members will tend to assume the form typical of that culture. In the second place, people coming together for the first time as a psychological group bring with them beliefs and attitudes concerning interpersonal relations that they have developed out of past group experience, and these beliefs, attitudes, and interpersonal skills will shape their behavior in the new group to a considerable extent.

Limitations on group determination of individual's roles.—The fact that a person's behavior in the group is not determined entirely by the structure and nature of the group—whether psychological group or social organization—has significant practical implications and testifies to the dangers that may inhere in completely disregarding individual considerations when dealing with groups. This is attested to by the disappointing experiences of many people in administrative, supervisory, and leadership functions who have attempted to improve individual morale by making changes in the group situation that, theoretically,

should be conducive to improvement. Often they have discovered that the individual fails to respond properly to the changed situation. What they have overlooked is that the individual is not completely flexible, nor is he newborn with every new group. He may have habits of group living that may make it difficult for him to adjust to new group interpersonal relations. The "democratic" leader may thus find it difficult to function in a group that is so structured as to demand "autocratic" leadership; the German who has never been encouraged to behave democratically vis-a-vis officialdom will find it difficult suddenly to "make like a democrat" when the American Military Government creates a democratic setup.[8]

Lewin in his analysis of groups indicates that the group cannot be a totally restricting force and that when it becomes so "the individual will be unhappy; too intense a frustration will force him to leave the group or even destroy the group."

2. What a group means to an individual.

(a) The group as the ground on which a person stands. The speed and determination with which a person proceeds, his readiness to fight or to submit, and other important characteristics of his behavior depend upon the firmness of the ground on which he stands and upon his general security. The group a person belongs to is one of the most important constituents of this ground. If a person is not clear about his belongingness or if he is not well established within his group, his life-space will show the characteristics of an unstable ground.

(b) The group as a means. Closely related to this is the fact that the group for the individual has often the position of a means. From early childhood the individual is accustomed to using a group relation, for instance, his relation to the mother, or to the family, as a means to achieving various physical and social goals. Later on, the prestige a person acquires because of belonging to a certain group, family, university, club, etc., is one of the important vehicles to his achievements: he is treated by the outsider as a part of this group.

(c) The person as a part of a group. The change in the circum-

[8] By permission from *Theory and Problems of Social Psychology* by David Krech and Richard Crutchfield. Copyright, 1948. McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc. Pp. 372–374.

stances of an individual is to a great extent directly due to a change in the situation of the group of which he is a part. An attack upon his group, a rise or a decline of his group, means an attack upon him, a rise or a decline of his position. As a member of a group he, usually, has the ideals and goals one has in this group.

(d) The group as a life-space. Finally the group is for the individual a part of the life-space in which he moves about. To reach or maintain a certain status or position within this group is one of the vital goals of the individual. His status in the group, the amount of space of free movement within it, and similar group properties, are important in determining the life-space of the individual. It will be clear at the outset how much marriage means in the life-space of the individual.

B. *The adaptation of the individual to the group.*

1. Group needs and individual freedom.

Belonging to a certain group does not mean that the individual must be in accord in every respect with the goals, regulations, and the style of living and thinking of the group. The individual has to a certain degree his own personal goals. He needs a sufficient space of free movement within the group to pursue those personal goals and to satisfy his individual wants. The problem of adaptation to, and successful living in, a group can be stated from the point of view of the individual in the following manner: How is it possible sufficiently to satisfy one's own individual needs without losing membership and status within the group? If the space of free movement of the individual within the group is too small, in other words, if his independence of the group is insufficient, the individual will be unhappy; too intense a frustration will force him to leave the group or even destroy the group, if it limits the free movement of its members too severely.

2. Methods of adapting individual needs and group needs.

How the adjustment of the individual to the group has to be made depends upon the character of the group; the position of the individual within the group; the individual character of the person (especially the degree of independence he may need to be happy).

There are great differences in the manner in which individual and group needs are reconciled. The restrictions set up by the group may

leave the individual much or little freedom. The restrictions may be based upon the democratic consent of the members of the group, or imposed by the will of an autocratic regime.[9]

If there exists a need to change an organizational pattern from autocracy to democracy then it must be a carefully developed process by which the group atmosphere is changed. The school administrator desiring to foster a democratic school system must recognize that this can best be achieved through democratic leadership—preached and practiced.

> The studies of group life in various fields suggest a few general principles for changing group culture.
>
> (a) The change has to be a change of group atmosphere rather than of single items. We have discussed this problem already. Technically it means that the change cannot be accomplished by learning tricks. It must be deeper than the verbal level or the level of social or legal formalities.
>
> (b) It can be shown that the system of values which governs the ideology of a group is dynamically linked with other power aspects within the life of the group. This is correct psychologically as well as historically. Any real change of the culture of a group is, therefore, interwoven with the changes of power constellation within the group.
>
> (c) From this point it will be easily understood why a change in methods of leadership is probably the quickest way to bring about a change in the cultural atmosphere of a group. For the status and power of the leader or of the leading section of a group make them the key to the ideology and the organization of the life of that group.
>
> Experiments on groups and leadership training suggest the following conclusions:
>
> (a) The change of a group atmosphere from autocracy or laissez faire to democracy through a democratic leader amounts to a re-education of the followers toward "democratic followership." Any group atmosphere can be conceived of as a pattern of role playing. Neither the autocratic nor the democratic leader can play his role without the

[9] Kurt Lewin, *Resolving Social Conflicts*, Gertrud W. Lewin (editor), Harper & Brothers, New York, 1948, pp. 84–87.

followers being ready to play their role accordingly. Without the members of the group being able and ready to take over those responsibilities which are essential for followerships in a democracy, the democratic leader will be helpless. Changing a group atmosphere from autocracy toward democracy through a democratic leadership, therefore, means that the autocratic followers must shift toward a genuine acceptance of the role of democratic followers.

(b) The experiments show that this shift in roles cannot be accomplished by a "hands off" policy. To apply the principle of "individualistic freedom" merely leads to chaos. Sometimes people must rather forcefully be made to see what democratic responsibility toward the group as a whole means. It is true that people cannot be trained for democracy by autocratic methods. But it is equally true that to be able to change a group atmosphere toward democracy the democratic leader has to be in power and has to use his power for active re-education. There is no space here to discuss in detail what to some might appear as one of the paradoxes of democracy. The more the group members become converted to democracy and learn to play the roles of democracy as followers or leaders, the more can the power of the democratic leader shift to other ends than converting the group members.

(c) From what has been said up to now it should be clear that lecture and propaganda do not suffice to bring about the necessary change. Essential as they are, they will be effective only if combined with a change in the power relations and leadership of the group. For larger groups, this means that a hierarchy of leaders has to be trained which reaches out into all essential sub-parts of the group. Hitler himself has obviously followed very carefully such a procedure. The democratic reversal of this procedure, although different in many respects, will have to be as thorough and as solidly based on group organization.

(d) By and large the same principle holds for the training of democratic leaders as for the training of the other members of the group. Democratic leaders cannot be trained autocratically; it is, on the other hand, of utmost importance that the trainer of democratic leaders establish and hold his position of leadership. It is, furthermore, very important that the people who are to be changed from another atmosphere toward democracy be dissatisfied with the previous situation and feel the need for a change. There are indications that it is easier to

change an unsatisfied autocratic leader toward democratic techniques than to change a laissez faire type of leader or a satisfied half-democratic leader. This may be contrary to the popular notion that a change is the more easily accomplished the greater the similarity between the beginning and the end situation. From the general theory of cultural change it is, however, understandable why after small changes the tendency to return to the previous level of equilibrium might be stronger than after great changes.[10]

Tead has effectively summarized the conditions that must exist if group loyalty and morale are to be satisfactory, conditions that are necessary for the successful and efficient operation of an organization.

In terms of corporate life, the analogous conditions necessary for the improvement of organization loyalty and morale would therefore be as follows: (1) There has to be a common desire to join the team, to play the game and to agree to conditions laid down for joining up; (2) there has to be careful selection of the group who are to work together; (3) there has to be good leadership; (4) the health work for employees has to be effective; (5) the working conditions and work arrangements have to be good; (6) the training for the job and for the organization has to be excellent; (7) the members of each department should perform as a conscious unit of a larger whole; (8) each worker should be supplied with the knowledge necessary for intelligent progress at his work; (9) there should be performance records regularly available to the workers; (10) there should be careful provisions for reward, incentive and approval of good work; (11) there should be some occasional, explicit acknowledgment of the prosperity or progress of the enterprise as shared by all.[11]

III

The school executive needs to (1) acquire an understanding of the manner in which individuals and groups perform; (2) develop

[10] Kurt Lewin, *Resolving Social Conflicts,* Gertrud W. Lewin (editor), Harper & Brothers, New York, 1948, pp. 49–51.

[11] By permission from *The Art of Administration,* by Ordway Tead. Copyright, 1951. McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc. P. 154.

skills for working with and through individuals and groups; (3) develop an appreciation of the significant influence the group has upon the individual and the organization; and (4) think critically about the ways individual and group activity can foster organizational growth. Group action survives best in an atmosphere amicable to such activities. The executive has the responsibility for conditioning the environment so that constructive group process can survive, and this is best accomplished when the administrator is an active participant in the process.

An either-or dichotomy between individual enterprise and group activity does not exist, for each is dependent upon the other for survival. The executive works with and through groups because an organization is a composite of groups and it is through these groups that the purposes of the organization must be fulfilled. The benefits to be gained by the individual and the organization through group activity are of such significance as to merit the time, effort, and resources that must be expended to stimulate successful group process.

1. Experimentally it has been demonstrated that group learning tends to be more efficient than individual learning.
2. The quality of work whether it be the guidance of children or the production of telephones is often improved by cooperative effort.
3. Individual acceptance of directives, orders, requests, and decisions is facilitated when the group accepts what has to be done.
4. Belongingness appears to be a psychological necessity for most human beings and this need can be met through the groups within the organization. The psychologically adjusted individual functions more efficiently in the organization than the maladjusted.
5. Individuals will exhibit greater willingness to perform if they have had a share in planning.

6. Opportunities for leadership are provided through the development of group activities.

In all organizations there are decisions to be made, plans to be developed, problems to be solved, and appraisals to be secured. These activities can be accomplished by individuals and then imposed upon others who must put them into action programs, or they can be group activities. While there is a choice for the administrator, the evidence clearly indicates it is with and through groups that the most efficient administration results. If there is need for caution it is in the recognition by the administrator of the responsibility for effecting a proper balance between individualism and group activity.

REFERENCES

ADORNO, T. W., FRENKEL-BRUNSWICK, ELSE, LEVINSON, DANIEL J., and SANFORD, R. NEVITT, *The Authoritarian Personality,* Harper & Brothers, New York, 1950.

APPLEBY, PAUL H., *Big Democracy,* Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., New York, 1945, chaps. 3, 12, 14.

BAKKE, E. WRIGHT, *Bonds of Organization,* Harper & Brothers, New York, 1950, chaps. 3, 5, 7, 8.

BARNARD, CHESTER I., *The Functions of the Executive,* Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1948, chaps. 6, 7, 8, 9.

BARNARD, CHESTER I., *Organization and Management,* Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1948, chaps. 1, 9.

BENNE, KENNETH D., and MUNTYAN, BOZIDAR, *Human Relations in Curriculum Change,* The Dryden Press, New York, 1951.

BERRIEN, F. K., *Comments and Cases on Human Relations,* Harper & Brothers, New York, 1951, chaps. 4, 5, 8.

BETHEL, LAWRENCE L., ALWATER, FRANKLIN S., SMITH, GEORGE H. E., and STUCKMAN, HARVEY A., JR., *Industrial Organization and Management,* 2d ed., McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., New York, 1950, chaps. 19, 20, 22.

BOGARDUS, EMORY S., *Sociology,* 3d ed., The Macmillan Company, New York, 1949, chaps. 11, 12, 13, 14, 15.

BRITT, STEWART H., *Social Psychology of Modern Life,* rev. ed., Rinehart & Company, Inc., New York, 1949, chaps. 11, 12.

BROWN, ALVIN, *Organization A Formulation of Principle,* Hibbert Printing Company, New York, 1945, chaps. 20, 21.

BROWN, ALVIN, *Organization of Industry,* Prentice-Hall, Inc., New York, 1947, chap. 9.

BROWNELL, BAKER, *The Human Community,* Harper & Brothers, New York, 1950.

CARTWRIGHT, DORWIN, and ZANDER, ALVIN, *Group Dynamics,* Row, Peterson and Company, Evanston, Illinois, 1953.

DAHIR, JAMES, *Communities for Better Living,* Harper & Brothers, New York, 1950, chap. 2.

DAVIS, RALPH C., *The Fundamentals of Top Management,* Harper & Brothers, New York, 1951, chap. 16.

DEHUSZAR, GEORGE B., *Practical Applications of Democracy,* Harper & Brothers, New York, 1945, chaps. 1, 2, 3, 10.

DUBIN, ROBERT, *Human Relations in Administration,* Prentice-Hall, Inc., New York, 1951, chaps. 15, 16.

ELDRIDGE, SEBA *et al., Fundamentals of Sociology,* Thomas Y. Crowell Company, New York, 1950, chap. 22.

FAYOL, HENRI, *General and Industrial Management,* Sir Isaac Pitman & Sons, Ltd., London, 1949, chaps. 2, 4.

GARDNER, BURLEIGH B., and MOORE, DAVID G., *Human Relations in Industry,* rev. ed., Richard D. Irwin, Inc., Chicago, 1950.

GLOVER, JOHN D., and HOWER, RALPH M., *The Administrator, Cases on Human Relations in Business,* Richard D. Irwin, Inc., Chicago, 1949.

GOLDEN, CLINTON S., and RUTTENBERG, HAROLD J., *The Dynamics of Industrial Democracy,* Harper & Brothers, New York, 1942, chaps. 1, 8.

GOULDNER, ALVIN W. (editor), *Studies in Leadership,* Harper & Brothers, New York, 1950, part I.

GULICK, LUTHER, and URWICK, L. (editors), *Papers on the Science of Administration,* Institute of Public Administration, New York, 1937, chap. 7.

HALSEY, GEORGE D., *Handbook of Personnel Management,* Harper & Brothers, New York, 1947, chap. 1.

HARRELL, THOMAS WILLARD, *Industrial Psychology,* Rinehart & Company, Inc., New York, 1949, chaps. 13, 15.

HILLMAN, ARTHUR, *Community Organization and Planning,* The Macmillan Company, New York, 1950, part I.

HOSLETT, SCHUYLER DEAN, *Human Factors in Management,* rev. ed., Harper & Brothers, New York, 1951.

KIMBALL, DEXTER S., and KIMBALL, DEXTER S., JR., *Principles of Industrial Organization,* 5th ed., McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., New York, 1939, chaps. 24, 25.

KLUCKHOHN, CLYDE, *Mirror for Man,* McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., New York, 1949, chap. 8.

KRECH, DAVID, and CRUTCHFIELD, RICHARD, *Theory and Problems of Social Psychology,* McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., New York, 1948, chaps. 10, 11.

LEIGHTON, ALEXANDER H., *The Governing of Men,* Princeton University Press, Princeton, New Jersey, 1946, part II.

LESTER, RICHARD A., *Labor and Industrial Relations,* The Macmillan Company, New York, 1951, chap. 25.

LEWIN, KURT, *Resolving Social Conflicts,* Gertrud W. Lewin (editor), Harper & Brothers, New York, 1948.

LEWIN, KURT, *Field Theory in Social Science,* edited by Dorwin Cartwright, Harper & Brothers, New York, 1951.

LIVINGSTON, ROBERT T., *The Engineering of Organization and Management,* McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., New York, 1949, chap. 3.

MACIVER, R. M., *Society, A Textbook of Sociology,* Rinehart & Company, Inc., New York, 1937, book II.

MACIVER, R. M., *The Web of Government,* The Macmillan Company, New York, 1947, chap. 13.

MANNHEIN, KARL, *Freedom, Power, and Democratic Planning,* Oxford University Press, New York, 1950, chaps. 3, 7.

MARX, FRITZ MORSTEIN (editor), *Elements of Public Administration,* Prentice-Hall, Inc., New York, 1946, chap. 21.

MAYO, ELTON, *The Social Problems of an Industrial Civilization,* Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1945.

MEADOWS, PAUL, *The Culture of Industrial Man,* University of Nebraska Press, Lincoln, Nebraska, 1950, chaps. 3, 6, 7.

MILWARD, C. E., *An Approach to Management,* Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1947, part I.

NEWCOMB, THEODORE M., *Social Psychology,* The Dryden Press, New York, 1950.

ROETHLISBERGER, F. J., *Management and Morale,* Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1950.

SARGENT, S. STANSFELD, *Social Psychology, An Integrative Interpretation,* The Ronald Press Company, New York, 1950, chaps. 10, 13.

SHERIF, MUZAFER, *An Outline of Social Psychology,* Harper & Brothers, New York, 1948, part II.

SLOTKIN, J. S., *Social Anthropology,* The Macmillan Company, New York, 1950, chap. 13.

SOMERVELL, HUBERT, *Industrial Peace in Our Time,* The Macmillan Company, New York, 1950, chap. 13.

TAYLOR, GORDON R., *Are Workers Human?* Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston, 1952.

TEAD, ORDWAY, *The Art of Administration,* McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., New York, 1951, chaps. 2, 10.

TRECKER, HARLEIGH, *Group Process in Administration,* The Woman's Press, New York, 1946.

VILLALON, LOUIS J. A. (editor), *Management Men and Their Methods,* Funk & Wagnalls Co., New York, 1949, chaps. 21, 28.

WATKINS, GORDON S., DODD, PAUL A., MCNAUGHTON, WAYNE L., and PRASOW, PAUL, *The Management of Personnel and Labor Relations,* 2d ed., McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., New York, 1950, chaps. 7, 8.

WHITE, LEONARD, *Introduction to the Study of Public Administration,* 3d ed., The Macmillan Company, New York, 1948, chap. 31.

WHYTE, WILLIAM FOOTE (editor), *Industry and Society,* McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., New York, 1946, chaps. 1, 2, 3, 4.

WHYTE, WILLIAM FOOTE, *Pattern for Industrial Peace,* Harper & Brothers, New York, 1951.

YODER, DALE, *Personnel Management and Industrial Relations,* Prentice-Hall, Inc., New York, 1946, chaps. 1, 3, 17.

CHAPTER VII

The Function of Planning in Administration

Does planning contribute to or lessen the adaptability of an organization?

Does planning result in lost motion when anticipated events do not transpire? Is it possible to plan seriously beyond a foreseeable future?

Does planning by a group suppress or discourage individual freedom and initiative?

Does group planning subordinate the expert? Can group planning ever be something other than group study of the tentative formulation of a plan by an individual?

Can planning be more than the process of selecting ways and means by which to attempt achievement of recognized objectives?

I

Democratic society is by nature a *planning* society. Its attributes include the social mechanisms necessary to bring needed changes about in an orderly fashion. Democratic society is dynamic, adjustable, and stable because of its mechanisms of change. That stability through change is possible gives democratic organization its resilience and strength in times of great stress.

On the other hand, authoritarian societies are *planned* societies resisting change, rigid rather than resilient, characterized by revolutionary rather than evolutionary modification, threatened by developing civilization rather than profiting thereby, and inherently unstable because of their lack of orderly processes of adaptation.

In the area of school organization, the strengths of an essentially democratic system or the weaknesses of an essentially authoritarian system may be apparent. The *planning* school system is dynamic, adaptable, and stable because of its ability to make changes without destroying the system. The *planned* school system, as in the case of the *planned* society, is in the main static, defensive, resistant, subject to periodic upheavals as changes are forced upon it, and basically unstable. Within the school as within the society encompassing the school, there will be those who confuse rigidity with strength and continuous planning with planlessness or indecision. But to those who prefer evolutionary social change to revolutionary social change, and recognize that change *will* come whether or not planning for it is done, the orderly processes of democracy seem the method of intelligence and the proper instruments of thoughtful people.

Since planning is anticipatory and future situations to be encountered are only to be guessed at in the main, clear recognition of immediate and more remote objectives is essential. Long-range planning does indeed require recognition of distant, and yet primary, objectives and the ability to profit from a kind of vicarious experiencing in advance of the fact. The good long-range planner must be a person of more than ordinary vision and perception. The stimulating leader must be one possessed of the ability to look far into the future and to transmit his idea, that is to say, his *plan,* to others who will be fired into action. The school administrator through planning lifts his work above the level of day-to-day progression and extends his horizons in every direction.

Planning is a time-saving, an effort-saving, and a money-saving activity. It selects from among alternative courses of action without dependence upon wasteful trial-and-error and yet can provide for adjustment to the need for correcting a course embarked upon. It contributes to efficiency in administration and by its absence makes efficiency, however determined, highly unlikely.

But important as planning is to the administrator in the conduct

of tasks which are clearly his to perform, the larger planning important to the school is not his to perform alone. Planning *with* persons whose effort must be depended upon to carry out an activity which has been planned brings those individuals into a relationship favorable to their wanting to participate in the activity and favorable to their understanding of it. Planning *with* teachers and others helps the administrator in his leading of those individuals to identify themselves with the activity and with the success or failure of it. Planning *for* persons who must be entrusted with the carrying out of the ensuing activity may result in their being in a sense detached from the activity and its success or failure, even while they are charged with responsibility for it. Planning *for* others on the part of the administrator often repels individuals who might through their participation in the planning of it come to identify themselves with it. This is to say that the planning itself is as important in its own way as the plan which is developed.

The foregoing may appear to be urging wide participation in planning as a means of developing cooperation and understanding through subtle coercion. To the extent that such coercion is the aim of the administrator, it may be argued that his leadership, while carrying the trappings of democracy, is not truly democratic leadership. Teamwork or partnership in planning is missing. The difficulties of securing free participation in planning so that the best powers of all the participants will be drawn upon can be recognized. But it is through such putting together of many heads that it can be demonstrated that many heads are better than one. The absence of either overt or covert coercion toward group decision or action would seem to be an important condition.

However, even in small schools, the bringing in of all persons concerned into all aspects of the planning activity is not necessary nor particularly desirable. Large planning activities involving long-range or sweeping projections may be participated in by large groups. The smaller plans within the large project and the short-

range plans often call for smaller groups or individuals who, guided by the general and more extensive plan and by the wishes of the larger group, may discharge their functions in full accord with democratic principles. The community, the board of education, and the school personnel may sketch the broad plan and thereby become identified with it and interested in its accomplishment, while charging the administrator or other individual or group of individuals with the development of details. Planning in a democracy should employ large or small group participation as particular situations indicate need, and individual activity should be determined by the necessity for individuals to work out the details that are not group tasks by nature. There is no compromise with democratic principles in the assignment of responsibility to small groups or individuals for functions best discharged that way. There is, to the contrary, most often a need for individuals or small groups to lead in the development of ideas to be submitted to larger groups for consideration and possible action. The school administrator in the role of democratic leader should be properly a stimulator of group activity while refraining carefully from dominating group decision or action. This is true whether the group is the school board, the professional personnel, the school children, or community groups concerned with the schools.

Planning in a school involves several activities not all of which can be identified clearly as definite steps in a process. First is the determination of the question: Who is to do the planning? Included in the effort to answer the question will be the development of groups to the point of entering upon the planning activity, the tentative or prospective assignment of individual responsibilities (such as those of group chairmen, resource persons, data gatherers, formulators of proposals to groups, and the like), the determination of group structure (except where the group is already formed for the purpose), and the preparation of tentative assignments to groups where more than one group will participate in the planning.

Second is the collection of pertinent data, background information, and tentative or speculative identification of the situation or situations which are prospective in the light of the felt need which has called up the planning activity.

Third is the formulation of a plan which is general in nature but supported by detailed plans presently or prospectively and containing statements of policy to govern both those engaged in the planning of details and those whose task it will be to put the plan into effect.

Fourth is the preparation of such detail within the general plan as circumstances require and the projection of the planning activity in those directions indicated by the areas of incompleteness in the general plan.

These several steps are not necessarily sequential although they may be. The elaborateness of the planning activity is determined by the size, scope, and significance of the plan which is to be developed.

II

Planning sometimes seems to be the antithesis of action, and the time spent in planning may be begrudged by those who would prefer to be up and doing. Yet efficient and effective planning is the great timesaver of busy executives who could multiply their powers by the expedient of sitting down in quiet, even if brief, contemplation of a problem and the solutions among which choice must be made. The plan is a projection into a future in which there is always hazard but also some probability to be identified through thought before action. The alternative to such planning before action appears often to be trial-and-error activity with associated dissipation of time and energy. Planning selects among alternatives, explores routes before travel begins, and identifies possible or probable outcomes of actions before the executive and his organization is committed to any. The busy and harassed administrator who substitutes activity for planning at the beginning

of a project may seem to be a high-powered executive who gets results without wasting time in idle contemplation. Yet he may often be the counterpart of Stephen Leacock's hero who leaped upon his horse and rode off rapidly in all directions.

But planning as a fundamental part of administrative activity is inescapable if any large group enterprise is to succeed. The school administrator with others in the broad field of public administration must be a planner if the ends of a dynamic and democratically based society are to be realized.

Planning is preparation for action. It is the vital step in any great enterprise, for many subsequent decisions about organization, procedure, personnel, and policies must flow from an original conception of purpose. All administrative agencies are set up to accomplish some desired goal. In a sense, all the problems of administration are problems of translating purpose into action. The first concern of administrators at all times is raising and answering the question, "What am I expected to accomplish?" The second concern is, "How shall I accomplish it?"

Planning gives meaning to action. The work done by an administrative agency will achieve its goals only if careful plans have been prepared which show what is to be accomplished. Otherwise, there may be much action of all kinds, but few results. Or the many activities undertaken may lead to contradictory results.

Planning is a technique or process. In itself, the word "planning" suggests no goals. It merely means that some method is followed which results in determining what is wanted and in a plan of action for reaching that desired goal. Planning is a method of approaching problems —a method which says, "Let us define clearly what it is we wish to do," and then asks, "What steps shall we take in order to accomplish our purpose?"

Planning is continuous. Just as life is dynamic and everchanging, so must planning by individuals and by organized groups be dynamic. Early plans may become inadequate as new factors in any situation are discovered, as changing circumstances occur, as we grow and learn more about the environment in which we live. Plans must accordingly

be modified from time to time. Periodic or even continuous review of fundamental purposes is desirable for any institution or any group in order to ensure that the work done will meet present conditions and needs.

In reviewing the quality of any administrative agency, the analyst today usually begins with these questions: "What steps are taken to define the purpose and objectives of the agency? Is there a plan of action? How comprehensive is the plan? Is the program reviewed from time to time?" These and similar questions are vital because all other problems—including problems in structural arrangement, budgeting, personnel, reporting, and working relationships—must be examined in the light of their influence upon realizing the plans of the agency.

Just what kind of planning does an administrative agency do? What about the role of the legislature in our scheme of government? For one thing, in recent years the advance planning of the broad objectives of national action has become more and more a function of the executive branch of our government. To such planning all administrative agencies contribute. The same tendency has developed in state and local governments. The legislature today reviews, criticizes, and modifies the plans prepared by administrative agencies under the coordinative responsibility of the chief executive

For many reasons, we have found that legislatures by themselves are not in a position to formulate broad programs of action. This, of course, does not mean the inevitable destruction of democratic government. Even when administrative agencies do the planning, the final authority to approve or disapprove each proposal remains a legislative function. This is a very real and essential authority, not to be disparaged.

In addition to the need for administrative agencies to plan broad objectives for legislative consideration and sanction, there is the need for planning the details within the legislative framework. Frequently legislatures set forth their will in very general terms. The differences of opinion among lawmakers and the pressures of various groups converging on a legislature often prevent agreement except upon certain main purposes. The details, or the refinements, are left to be worked out.

Then, in the third place, there are the administrative plans in a more specific sense, the programs of work laid out to achieve the objectives finally agreed upon. These administrative plans may include the budget, the organization structure, and a time schedule of work accomplishment. This is preeminently a job of administration. It should never be attempted on the legislative level.

All these types of planning are closely related. The interplay of administrative planning, review of present programs, and formulating of new objectives goes on all the time. .[1]

Planning is essential to efficient business management and runs through the whole of an enterprise with all personnel desirably involved in planning some phases of the activity to be carried on.

A plan is the expansion of a decision. Planning is preparation for action. The first decision calls for not one plan but for several. The intelligent management plans how to attain its goal just as the intelligent motorist intending to drive from New York to Chicago consults road maps and lays out a route. Neither will insist upon just one way. If circumstances alter or if the occasion does not serve, some other way will already have been considered. These planned procedures will embrace a consideration of the purpose and the environment as well as the process itself. A plan must be sufficiently flexible to take account of changes, but it must always seek the same goal.

A plan is a basis for future action. To be complete, it must

1. Specify the objective that is to be sought and the conditions that are essential for the proper execution of the plan.
2. Recognize, define, and describe the basic factors involved in and affecting the solution.
3. Specify the methods and physical facilities to be applied.
4. Include the criteria to be used in judging the results.

Planning, it is wise to remember, is a preparation function. Actually, it is *preparation* for Preparation. It is the conscious forethought that

[1] John D. Millett, "Planning and Administration," *Elements of Public Administration,* Fritz Morstein Marx (editor), Prentice-Hall, Inc., New York, 1946, pp. 121–126.

precedes actual action. The terms differ at the different levels. Top management plans in broad detail. Administration is more specific; it explores alternatives and selects the best. Management accepts the specific alternative selected by administration and plans how best to realize it. Supervision plans the best use of mechanical and human facilities. Finally, each worker plans, or should plan, his own work.[2]

Planning is part of orderliness in thinking and acting. Since administration desirably is orderly and projects out of thoughtful consideration of issues, alternatives, and probable outcomes, Urwick's comments are pertinent to the study of executive activity.

Planning is fundamentally an intellectual process, a mental predisposition to do things in an orderly way, to think before acting, and to act in the light of facts rather than of guesses. It is the antithesis of the gambling, the speculative tendency.

Planning is not a matter of superimposing some new authority. Almost everyone is much too inclined to think of it in these terms. It is much more a question of providing existing authorities with information sufficient to enable them to coordinate their work effectively and accurately.

If action is to be methodical and orderly, purposeful, and not at the mercy of each new circumstance, there must be a plan. The characteristics of a good plan are:

(a) That it is based on a clearly defined objective.
(b) That it is simple.
(c) That it provides for a proper analysis and classification of actions, i.e., that it establishes standards.
(d) That it is flexible.
(e) That it is balanced.
(f) That it uses available resources to the utmost before creating new authorities and new resources—really a special application of the principle of simplicity.[3]

[2] By permission from *The Engineering of Organization and Management*, by Robert T. Livingston. Copyright, 1949. McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc. Pp. 128–130.

[3] L. Urwick, *The Elements of Administration*, Harper & Brothers, New York, 1943, pp. 33–34.

The planning process will vary according to the extent of the projected activity and the circumstances under which the planning is carried on. There are times when decisions must be made hurriedly and plans implemented before they are wholly formed. There are other times when the planning process can be carried on slowly with all pertinent matter considered thoroughly before decisions have to be made. Long-range educational planning cannot be accomplished without attending to steps such as those suggested by Elliott and Mosier.

in all educational situations several characteristic phases of the planning process will need to be taken into consideration.

1. Tentatively stating the objectives. This will involve considerable study and research, not only in education as such, but also in consideration of the role of education in a democracy and in civilization in general. What kind of a civilization do we want and what kind of an educational program will it take to help to bring about the desired improvements? More specifically, what should be the objectives of education to meet the educational needs of the people in the American community, state, or nation?

2. Determining the present status. Present status has implications for planning which are both general and specific. It will, therefore, be necessary to develop an adequate plan for assembling and interpreting the data regarding each major aspect of education in the given situation and for discovering existing interrelationships. The study and research made in connection with this aspect of planning will be made with consideration for both the present needs and the proposed objectives.

3. Formulating a specific program of objectives. A definition of the specific objectives to meet the needs of the people will grow out of a study of the present status of the educational program and of the educational services being rendered by other agencies in the community, viewing each specific need with reference to the tentative statement of general objectives. The specific objectives agreed upon will serve as a guide to the steps which are to follow.

4. Determining a course of action. This will define the steps which need to be taken to attain the objectives. These steps should be stated in specific and definite terms.

5. Translating the plan into action. This is often one of the most difficult phases. It requires the co-operation of many groups and individuals and involves a long period of active participation on the part of these persons to assure their understanding and support of the plan.

6. Continuing appraisals. If the steps do not work out as contemplated or the objectives do not meet the educational needs of the people, these facts should be ascertained as promptly as possible. Constant appraisal is essential to determine the respects in which the plan is not working satisfactorily and the ways in which it should be modified.

7. Replanning when necessary. Few if any plans are perfect in their original form, and replanning is necessary to correct defects and to assure that the plan will meet the needs for which it is designed. .[4]

Executives may find that the details which plague them and prevent the most efficient use of time on the job are demanding of separate attention because the organization lacks an over-all plan which accounts for and disposes of details which appear routinely. The freeing of an administrator from the multitude of details which can be his lot is an objective to which the organizational plan can contribute. The necessity is that details be handled, not ignored, and that they be handled in a way to contribute to the smooth functioning of the organization. Though small matters will continue to be brought to the attention of the chief administrator of an organization, they ought to be brought in keeping with what has been termed *the exception principle.* That *principle* can be developed only under an organization plan incorporating processes for handling the recurring and unexceptional.

The importance of saving the time of major executives requires the use of the exception principle. A person responsible for the conduct

[4] Eugene B. Elliott and Earl E. Mosier, "Organization of Planning for Education," *American Education in the Postwar Period, Part Two, Structural Reorganization, Forty-fourth Yearbook,* National Society for the Study of Education, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1945, pp. 275–276.

of large affairs, whether or not they fall in the field of business, soon learns that his effectiveness is limited if he attempts to take care of all details personally. Consequently, he must rely upon others to attend to matters that repeat themselves or that are relatively unimportant. Only thus may his own time be conserved for those matters with which he alone can deal. The device by which most executives conserve their time is termed the "exception principle," which means merely the delegation to others of recurring matters. Once the executive sees that the recurrence will be frequent, he establishes a policy and routine as a guide to handling such situations and then delegates the responsibility for dealing with them to subordinates. He is thus able to concentrate his attention upon emergencies, special questions, and new problems.

It is evident from the foregoing discussion that such delegations as we have described can take place satisfactorily only after due attention has been given to certain prerequisites:

1. Placing subordinates at key points, who have sufficient capacity and training.
2. Establishment of adequate systems.
3. Determination of policies where needed.
4. Provision of enough records and reports to indicate whether the system and rules are followed, and whether or not the assigned tasks are performed.

The exception principle, therefore, may be thought of as the capstone of a well-developed management in which are evident proper division of responsibility, clearly defined authority, and capable executives whose activities are coordinated into a smoothly working team.

If the time of high-priced major officials is to be conserved for important matters only, the multitude of unimportant items that repeat themselves day after day must be taken care of by the clerical staff and by subexecutives according to a definite procedure, called a system. A system may be defined as any orderly method or procedure. It may be so simple as to be ineffective, or so intricate as to create red tape. However, if the same routine, whether good or bad, is followed repetitively, it is a system.

Much of the same function is performed by policies, which are of the utmost importance as guides to executives in making consistent

decisions. If well considered, policies prevent mistakes, and help to bring into an organization the sense of direction that is so necessary for consistency and progress. Policies may be either written or unwritten, and may be classified as major or minor, according to their relation to the company's well-being. Unless he is a complete opportunist, every executive follows policies of some kind. The important point is that policies should be logical, far-sighted, and in accordance with the facts in so far as they are known. Consequently, a cardinal principle of management is that a business should be guided by policies that are clear-cut and definite, that represent the best thinking of its executive group, and that are formulated before action is taken.

Records and reports are the fourth leg upon which the exception principle rests. Reports indicate to a superior whether or not particular missions assigned by him have been carried out. Moreover, records of performance flowing up the channels of command from each level of authority to those above enable an executive to spot those particular features of his activities that call for correction. By analyzing comparisons between actual and planned results, and between actual performance and "standard," he can pass over those operations that are satisfactory and concentrate on those that call for action.[5]

Planning in an educational system occupies Elliott and Mosier as they list principles in planning educational programs in keeping with the broad and persistent needs of democratic society.

If educational planning is to be successful and is to attain maximum results it must be based on and grow out of certain fundamental principles which should be clearly recognized and fully utilized. Among the most important of these principles are the following:

1. Educational planning must be recognized as one aspect of the general problem of community, state, and national planning. Educators must recognize that planning an educational system involves consideration for all aspects of life and of government. Successful educational planning, therefore, cannot be carried on in isolation, but must be properly related to and integrated with other planning programs.

[5] C. C. Balderston and Others, *Management of An Enterprise*, Prentice-Hall, Inc., New York, 1949, pp. 470–472.

2. One phase of educational planning should provide the basis for organized research; another phase should be built on and utilize fully the results of such research. Research is basic to planning. There can be no effective planning except as the results of research are utilized. However, research itself must be planned if it is to be effective. It is not always safe to rely on the facts which are available. The proper procedure is to determine what facts will be needed and then to develop a program for assuring that those facts will be available when needed and in such form that they can be utilized effectively.

3. Educational planning must be a continuous process requiring constant adaptation of plans to emerging needs. In a rapidly changing civilization, planning is not a process which can be undertaken one year with the thought that the remaining years will be devoted to carrying out the plans. There will undoubtedly be periods when more attention will be given to the development of new plans or to the revision of old plans than at other periods, but the most successful planning requires continuous research and study and periodic revision on the basis of evidence which is constantly being accumulated.

4. Satisfactory results can be attained only when definite provision is made within the educational organization for planning. There must be a definite plan for planning. School leaders have done quite a bit of talking about planning, but so far the results have been all too limited because too few state and local school systems and educational institutions have made any definite provision in their organization for planning. Definite planning responsibilities must be assigned to appropriate members of the staff in accordance with interest, organizational responsibility, and ability to contribute.

5. The planning procedure should be carefully formulated and systematically carried out. In order to facilitate the work of a planning group, the organization must appraise its resources and establish the best possible conditions for the work to be done. Very early in the deliberations of the group the assignment of responsibilities to individuals and subcommittees should be worked out. Each, in turn, should analyze its own functions and procedures in terms of sequence of effort and limit of time. Before committee action can go far, clarity of purpose

and responsibility must be determined, for only as communication of plans and ideas and interaction with the group become efficient, can the program be converted quickly into action. As soon as proposals and detailed studies are relayed to the larger planning organization, procedure for action may be initiated.

6. Planning, to be functional, must be realistic and practical but should not be needlessly limited by existing situations. Planning must face the situation as it exists and project logical and practical next steps as well as ultimate goals. There is always the two-fold danger that the group responsible for planning may get too far away from reality and submit proposals that are far ahead of the times and therefore considered impractical, or that they may become so conscious of the handicaps and limitations of existing conditions that they will hesitate to propose steps and objectives which are essential to progress.

An important principle of program building calls for early identification of conditions and regulations which may restrict developmental efforts. The inhibiting influence may exist in the form of pressure groups, economic hazards, community customs, or legislative enactments. Be what they may, these restrictions should be selected very soon for group consideration. If the restrictive influences cannot be eliminated, the future study, reflection, and planning should be tempered accordingly. The political strategist, the civic planner, or the community realist will first inquire into the nature of these barriers and then decide upon the values that must be achieved in spite of the obstacles to a sound program.

7. Educational planning should involve the active and continuing participation of all interested groups and organizations. In a democracy the people are responsible for the schools and, in the final analysis, must approve the scope and content of the educational program. It is essential, therefore, that they be given opportunity to participate in the development of that program. With the increasing need for co-ordinating related educational services, the function of planning must involve many different interests beyond the confines of the school. Parents and other laymen representing community interests are logically in a position to suggest more effective ways of utilizing the educational resources available. Obviously the technical details will need to be worked out by the professionally trained personnel, but the broad poli-

cies should be understood and approved by the supporting public, including the organizations whose co-operation will be needed in carrying out the program. The plan should be so developed that each of these groups can have an active part in some phase of the planning.

8. The content and scope of educational planning are determined by the needs of the individuals and groups to be served. Education has certain functions to perform. It cannot solve all of the problems of society or meet all of the needs of civilization. The services which are the proper responsibility of any educational organization can be determined by careful analysis of the needs of the groups to be served, and plans can then be projected for adequately providing those services.

9. Educational planning should be organized to utilize the services of specialists, and yet to avoid the possibility of domination by specialists. Educational planning should be carried out under the guidance of leaders representing the educational organization concerned, with the co-operation of any groups that are prepared to make a useful contribution.

In the planning process the specialist may be appropriately considered a resource person whose skills, knowledge, and general disposition make him a valuable person in working co-operatively with other individuals in defining the general problem and in formulating courses of action appropriate to its solution. He may contribute to the forces which move a group to action—which set forces free within the group to bring about a consummation of action. If the group is genuinely concerned about the direction and development of the program, the specialist within the group or resource person invited on a consultant basis should recognize that his membership status does not differ from others. It is expected he will serve as a working member, raise questions, and be questioned, voice criticism and suggestions, approval and disapproval of plans in light of the fundamental purposes for which the group has been selected.

10. The planning program should provide opportunity for all persons and groups affected by educational planning to understand and appreciate the value of the objectives, procedures, and recommendations.

11. Provision for continuing evaluation of the planning process is basis to the success of the program. Frequent evaluation tends to improve the work of an individual or group tremendously in revealing the success with which it has met and the difficulties still to be overcome. Through the utilization of evaluative evidence, some assurance is given that plans and procedures are readily adjusted to immediate needs. Future action too may be more intelligently arranged by reference to the evidence concerning current achievements.

12. Follow-up of the outcomes furnishes helpful information for appraising and modifying future action. The importance of basic studies of the effects of an educational program is commonly accepted as an essential of sound administration. Obviously the planners need data to confirm the validity and practicability of their procedures. The study of outcomes in the light of the fulfillment of a goal offers the evidence that may be essential for fulfilling future needs in education.[6]

All group activity is necessarily planned or the group could never move into action toward a common objective in the service of a group purpose. The plan, of course, may be almost no plan at all except that necessary to act in concert at a low level. At the other extreme, group activity of complex kind may be initiated in keeping with a detailed plan of wide scope, long-range projection, and far-reaching consequences. Some planning is necessary to all administration. Good planning is an administrative process serving the efficiency and accomplishment of an organization and freeing the administrator of the hampering details which can make him more manager than leader.

III

For the purpose of examining planning as one of the integral processes of administration, it is useful to set it apart from the rest of administrative activity. In actuality, of course, planning cannot be considered apart from the whole of the concern of the adminis-

[6] Eugene B. Elliott and Earl E. Mosier, "Organization of Planning for Education," *American Education in the Postwar Period, Part Two, Structural Reorganization, Forty-fourth Yearbook,* National Society for the Study of Education, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1945, pp. 268–272.

trator. Planning for planning's sake has no meaning. But there are times when the administrator ought to attend to his planning function in single-minded devotion. Though planning needs to be continuous as other administrative functions are continuous, it cannot be taken for granted. In the service of the group, leadership anticipates, proposes, projects, envisions, and influences choice among alternatives. Of all these, planning is composed and the plan develops as a simple or as a complex idea in terms of the circumstances which surround the planning activity. The outcome of good planning should be orderly progress toward selected goals.

Good planning results in conservation of time and energy, and adds to the efficiency and effectiveness with which an activity is carried on. The busy executive cannot afford *not* to take time for planning and cannot afford to have those with whom he works fail to spend time necessary for planning. All group activity is necessarily in response to planning of some kind. But poor planning is wasteful, whereas good planning conserves; poor planning serves only to get activity under way, while good planning guides and directs. In the test of activity, poor planning or insufficient planning can be costly in several ways. The care to plan well may seem to occupy valuable time which could be spent in driving toward an objective. Yet the drive without adequate planning may perform a disservice to the accomplishment of the desired objective.

The planning function in connection with a group enterprise such as that represented by a public school system is variously to be carried on. A plan may be developed by an individual, possibly the administrator, refined through consideration by other individuals or small groups, proposed to larger groups, adopted or rejected by the larger groups, implemented through group or individual activity, or returned to the originator for further development. A plan may grow out of group discussion, it may be sketched in general by the group as a whole, assigned to a smaller group or to an individual for development, and returned to the originating

group for approval and initiation. It is likely that groups are best able to give general consideration to proposals which are offered by individuals. The collaboration of individuals in very small groups may result in refinements of plans as well as in group acceptance or rejection, but the kind of creative thinking required in significant planning seems most likely to be a phenomenon of individual cerebration. The democratic principle is served, not through group development of an idea, but rather through group consideration and adoption or rejection of ideas.

Democratic procedure in administration calls for planning *with* not planning *for* the group. The principle is served as democratic leadership leads the group to ideas which it wants to consider or which it ought to consider. The necessity in any dynamic society, and democratic society by nature is dynamic, is planning without which the society must disintegrate when its long-range purposes no longer are served. The school system in a democratic social order must plan, or fail in its task. The administrator as leader has as his obligation the leading of groups to plan in the service of society. The implications are many, but to the school administrator his planning function is most significant when it is seen as integral in root, stem, and branch with the whole process of educational administration by which it is hoped that schools may fulfill their destiny.

REFERENCES

BALDERSTON, C. CANBY, BRECHT, ROBERT P., KARABASZ, VICTOR S., and RIDDLE, ROBERT J., *Management of an Enterprise,* 2d ed., Prentice-Hall, Inc., New York, 1949, chaps. 27, 28.

BROWN, ALVIN, *Organization of Industry,* Prentice-Hall, Inc., New York, 1947, chap. 13.

DAHIR, JAMES, *Communities for Better Living,* Harper & Brothers, New York, 1950, chap. 2.

DALE, ERNEST, *Planning and Developing the Company Organization Structure,* American Management Association, New York, 1952, Introduction.

DAVIS, RALPH C., *The Fundamentals of Top Management,* Harper & Brothers, New York, 1951, chap. 3.

DAVIS, RICHARD CURRIER, *Industrial Organization and Management,* Harper & Brothers, New York, 1940, chap. 2.

DIMOCK, MARSHALL E., *The Executive in Action,* Harper & Brothers, New York, 1945, chaps. 10, 11.

ELLIOTT, EUGENE B., and MOSIER, EARL E., "Organization of Planning for Education," *American Education in the Postwar Period, Part II, Structural Reorganization, Forty-fourth Yearbook,* National Society for the Study of Education, Chicago, 1945, pp. 266–294.

FAYOL, HENRI, *General and Industrial Management,* Sir Isaac Pitman & Sons, Ltd., London, 1949, chap. 5.

GAUS, JOHN MERRIMAN, *Reflections on Public Administration,* University of Alabama Press, University, Alabama, 1947, chap. 6.

HEMPEL, EDWARD H., *Top-Management Planning,* Harper & Brothers, New York, 1945, chaps. 1, 2.

HEMPEL, EDWARD H. (editor), *Small Plant Management,* McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., New York, 1950, chap. 5.

HILLMAN, ARTHUR, *Community Organization and Planning,* The Macmillan Company, New York, 1950, part II.

INTERNATIONAL CITY MANAGERS' ASSOCIATION, *The Technique of Municipal Administration,* 3d ed., The International City Managers' Association, Chicago, 1947, chap. 9.

INTERNATIONAL CITY MANAGERS' ASSOCIATION, *Local Planning Administration,* 2d ed., The International City Managers' Association, Chicago, 1948, chaps. 1, 2, 3, 4.

LEPAWSKY, ALBERT, *Administration,* Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., New York, 1949, chap. 16.

LEWIN, KURT, *Resolving Social Conflicts,* edited by Gertrud W. Lewin, Harper & Brothers, New York, 1948, chap. 13.

LIVINGSTON, ROBERT T., *The Engineering of Organization and Management,* McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., New York, 1949, chaps. 4, 5, 8.

MARX, FRITZ MORSTEIN (editor), *Elements of Public Administration,* Prentice-Hall, Inc., New York, 1946, chaps. 5, 6.

MEADOWS, PAUL, *The Culture of Industrial Man,* University of Nebraska Press, Lincoln, Nebraska, 1950, chap. 15.

MILWARD, G. E., *An Approach to Management,* Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1947, part II.

NEWMAN, WILLIAM H., *Business Policies and Management,* 2d ed., South-Western Publishing Company, Cincinnati, 1947, chap. 24.

NEWMAN, WILLIAM H., *Administrative Action,* Prentice-Hall, Inc., New York, 1951, part I.

PFIFFNER, JOHN M., *Public Administration,* rev. ed., The Ronald Press Company, New York, 1946, chap. 13.

ROSENFARB, JOSEPH, *Freedom and the Administrative State,* Harper & Brothers, New York, 1948, chaps. 7, 8.

SEARS, JESSE, *The Nature of the Administrative Process,* McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., New York, 1950, chap. 2.

SIMON, HERBERT A., *Administrative Behavior,* The Macmillan Company, New York, 1947, chap. 5.

SMITH, HAROLD D., *The Management of Your Government,* McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1945, chap. 2.

TRECKER, HARLEIGH, *Group Process in Administration,* The Woman's Press, New York, 1946, chap. 4.

URWICK, L., *The Elements of Administration,* Harper & Brothers, New York, 1943, chaps. 2, 3.

WALKER, ROBERT A., *The Planning Function in Urban Government,* 2d ed., University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1950, chaps. 4, 6, 7, 12.

WHITE, LEONARD, *Introduction to the Study of Public Administration,* 3d ed., The Macmillan Company, New York, 1948, chap. 14.

CHAPTER VIII

The Function of Communication in Administration

How is it possible for an administrator surrounded by his immediate staff to find out what is actually taking place in an organization?

What influence do the outside affiliations of employees have upon internal communication? Is it possible to transmit ideas in an organization when administrators are not a part of the groups to which the employees belong?

How can routine matters be expedited so that the channels of communication don't become clogged by trivia?

What effect does an informal system of communication have upon the formalized channels of communication? Is it sound administration to use the "grapevine" to test out proposed courses of action?

What provisions need to be created in an organization to enable groups to communicate?

I

It is the unique characteristic of man, the ability to communicate ideas, which has enabled him to move from the caves of prehistoric times to the skyscrapers of twentieth century civilization. When the means of communication were developed, it became possible for men to transmit their knowledge and skills to one another—each step bringing with it greater control over the social and physical environment. The pattern has evolved slowly from the drawing of crude picture-symbols on the walls of caves to instantaneous in-

ternational transmission of all manner of symbols. It has been an evolutionary process that has taken hundreds of years, not without setbacks and not without causing serious social adjustments. Control over the mechanistic aspects of communication has not been accompanied by comparable social understanding of the role of communication in life.

Through the ability to communicate, man has been able to construct massive monuments in his image, and modern man in particular has been able to communicate his ideas into the reality of twentieth century industrialization. Modern industrialization has created "bigness"—big government, big business, big labor, and big cities—which has resulted in organizations that are dependent upon communication for their survival. Communication is the catalytic means by which organizations are created, the means by which they are coordinated, and the means by which their purposes are translated into action.

The administrator confronted with the task of supplying leadership for an organization faces the reality of developing a system of communication which will assist the organization in accomplishing its essential purposes. To establish an effective system of communication the administrator must not only concern himself with organizational procedures but he must also study the human factors which comprise an organization. It is necessary in any organization to develop procedures—staff meetings, bulletins, conferences, and memoranda—that will transmit ideas, policies, problems, and routine from person to person and group to group. Procedural approaches, however, need to be created with an understanding of the psychological impact of communication upon the individuals who are the senders and recipients of the transmissions. The psychological impact of communication upon the individual is often to be directly noted in the fears, tensions, frustrations, and anxieties that manifest themselves.

While the individual forms the basic element in the communicative process, it is essential to recognize that communication is a

socially oriented concept involving the activity of two or more participants. The relationships between members of a group directly affect the way transmission will take place. Where the group is unified and morale is high, communication flows freely and interpretation is not distorted by individual self-interest. Splintered groups tend to pervert the communicative process and even the transmission of routine instructions becomes difficult.

Not only does the individual and his group affect the communicative process, but the varying situations in which the individual and the group operate also condition the process. An idea expressed at an informal luncheon meeting becomes a suggestion, whereas the same idea expressed at a staff meeting becomes an order. Staff members who would overtly resent public criticism will accept private, direct suggestions for improvement. Circumstantial conditioning makes it essential that the administrator consider the forces that operate in situations and use techniques appropriate to the time and place.

Administrators are charged with the responsibility for establishing channels of communication that allow the organization to operate effectively. It is therefore necessary that a structure be created which will permit the free flow of communication and which will open the channels of communication to all individuals and not just the persons at the managerial level. Individuals, no matter what their positions in the organization, must be given the opportunity to act as senders as well as recipients of communication. This, of course, does not imply a state of communication anarchy, with each individual indiscriminately using the channels nor does it imply that all communication is of equal value. Communication movement if it is to be effective must be vertical, movement up as well as down, and horizontal, across departmental lines.

Because organizations are informally structured as well as formally established, the administrator needs to be aware of the problems of communication circumvention. Circumvention is a problem that evolves as a result of the status system created by

formal and informal structural arrangements. The effect of circumvention is to evoke suspicion and uncertainty on the part of by-passed personnel and lead to organizational inefficiency. The administrator must use the formally established channels of communication at the same time that the informal structure—the "grapevine"—is used to facilitate the free flow of communication.

Communication is the nod of a head, the smile on a face, the known or unknown motives of the sender as well as the receiver. Communication is a process of transmitting symbols, verbal or otherwise. The study of semantics demonstrates that the transmission of symbols involves more than the routine dictation of a memorandum to a staff. Words that are used must be scrutinized for the effect that they will have upon staff members, for some verbal connotations can lead to gross misinterpretations. Professional propagandists have capitalized on this knowledge successfully to confuse social issues. A study of the contextual meaning of words also leads to a consideration of the vagueness and indefiniteness of many of our communication symbols. Words which are more to be characterized by their incomprehensibility than by their clarity strangle the channels of communication and lead to confusion. The administrator is constantly faced with the challenge of using the channels of communication so that the verbal symbols can find their proper implementation.

The successful administrator attains his effectiveness by developing the techniques of communication in a context devoted to an understanding and appreciation of the human relationships within the organization. Democratic societies maintain that the dignity and respect of the individual is of primary importance and communication becomes a means whereby this precept is made vital in an organization.

II

As one views the crises that have engulfed civilization during the twentieth century—World War I and World War II, disinte-

gration of empires, the rise of Fascism and Communism, economic collapses—it would not be difficult to conclude that mankind has almost completely failed in its efforts to establish communication between men. During this same period of history, however, mankind has succeeded in constructing techniques of communication undreamed of in the centuries that have preceded the birth of this millennium. Is the gap between technical and social skills inevitable? Mayo argues that people do not have the social skills which are so necessary in a constantly changing world.

Technical skill manifests itself as a capacity to manipulate things in the service of human purposes. Social skill shows itself as a capacity to receive communications from others, and to respond to the attitudes and ideas of others in such fashion as to promote congenial participation in a common task. The established society by its apprenticeship system developed technical and social skills simultaneously in the individual; psychoneurosis, the consequence of insufficient social discipline and practice, seems to have been less prevalent in successful established societies. In these days, education has gone over—often extravagantly—to the development of technical skills and the appropriate scientific bases for such skills. This would be excellent were it not for the fact that the universities have failed to develop an equivalent study of, and instruction in, social skill. Students are taught logical and lucid expression; they are not taught that social skill begins in the art of provoking, and receiving, communications from others. The attitudes and ideas thus communicated, by no means wholly logical, will serve to form the basis of a wider and more effective understanding.

Little of the old establishment survives in modern industry: the emphasis is upon change and adaptability; the rate of change mounts to an increasing tempo. *We have in fact passed beyond that stage of human organization in which effective communication and collaboration were secured by established routines of relationship.* For this change, physicochemical and technical development are responsible. It is no longer possible for an industrial society to assume that the technical processes of manufacture will exist unchanged for long in any type of work. On the contrary, every industry is constantly seeking

to change, not only its methods, but the very materials it uses; this development has been stimulated by the war. In the established societies of no more than a century ago, it was possible to assume a sufficient continuity of industrial processes, and therefore apprenticeship to a trade was the best method of acquiring skill, both technical and social. The technical skill required—that, namely, which is based upon adequate scientific and engineering knowledge and is consequently adaptable or even creative. On the other hand, the skill required of the machine-hand has drifted downwards; he has become more of a machine tender and less of a mechanic. Now this is not the place to discuss whether the latter change is altogether desirable, however admirable the former. But it is altogether proper to point out that no equivalent effort to develop social or collaborative skill has yet appeared to compensate or balance the technical development.[1]

That we have not failed completely, however, is evident in the defeat of the Fascist nations; the creation of the United Nations; the awakening of millions who are seeking education, self-government, and self-respect; and the increasing awareness by the average individual that the world is one. The need for effective communication is not only apparent in political life, it makes itself felt in business, governmental, and educational organizations. While the consequences of distorted communication in a school system are not as dramatic as a walk-out by the Russians at the United Nations, the immediate consequences for the personnel of the system may be more traumatic. When the superintendent informs the teaching staff of its responsibilities with regard to pupil liability, and the very next week a student is seriously injured by an automobile while performing a personal errand for a teacher, the action may precipitate dramatic consequences for the personnel involved.

The communications system is the means by which ideas, orders, and problems permeate the structure. Livingston draws an analogy

[1] Elton Mayo, *The Social Problems of an Industrial Civilization,* The Andover Press, Andover, Massachusetts, 1945, pp. 13–14.

between the communication system of an association and the nerve system of the human body.

An enterprise may be excellently organized, the whole coordinated and balanced, each member properly selected and trained, and yet be unable to function for lack of a system of communication. The communication system of an association is similar to the nerve system of the human body. It provides for the receipt and identification of stimuli and their transmission throughout the association to the place where the required response can be obtained. It further provides for the transmittal of orders from the point of decision to the point of action, and for the transmission of all necessary information throughout the association.

When a person is doing something for and by himself, it is to be presumed that he has a goal. He knows where he is going and why. As things progress, he is able to modify his actions according to the circumstances so that his goal will be realized with the least effort. If the environment changes drastically, the goal may, if necessary, be changed. If he changes his mind about objective or method, there is no particular problem. He does not have to tell himself about it. *He knows.* His system of internal communication was "built in," and much of the time it operates entirely without conscious thought.

On the other hand, when a group of people work together, the situation is much more difficult. A goal is set, the work task differentiated, and each person learns what is expected of him and what he can expect of others. This may be satisfactory as long as the situation remains constant. But no enterprise exists in an economic vacuum. Circumstances and environment change, the goal may alter, the method may require revision. Then everyone must be informed of the new situation.

The mere task of seeing that people are informed of the changed goal and plan is a very real problem. Individuals working for another not only must know all about their job, they must also at all times be aware of what the person they are working for is thinking. By the same token, the supervisor must know what his people are experiencing. Only then can things be modified to the best advantage. Where an organizational form or procedure, directive or enabling orders, or

any unit definition is changed, the organization as a whole as well as the unit concerned must be informed if the organization is to continue to function properly.

Communication involves the transmission of information upward, downward, and across. Orders are transmitted both upward and downward, in the first case in answer to external stimuli, in the second case in order to get action. Requests (a form of order) are transmitted across a structure. In general, a request is a short cut for a long path from one level to the top executive and down through another scalar path to the level of action.[2]

Communication involves the transmission of symbols through various channels by means of oral, written, and visual impulses. As the impulses are transmitted, it is necessary for the receiver to receive corresponding impulses if the communication cycle is to be completed. If the content of a message is received but not understood, the cycle cannot be completed. In many instances the failure to understand is a direct consequence of the differences in the frames of reference of the sender and the receiver. If the substance of an idea does not establish a conflict with the different basic beliefs of the various levels of the hierarchy, then the communication system is fluid and accomplishes its purpose. Newcomb underscores the importance of understanding the frame of reference of the expresser and the receiver in a communication system.

Communication is more than mere *ex*pression. It involves *im*pression, as well. An expression of a command, a question, or a hope is not communicated until and unless someone has received an impression corresponding to that command, question, or hope. The test of whether a corresponding impression has been received lies in the return communication. If, at the dinner table, you ask your neighbor to pass the butter, you know that your desire has been communicated if he does, in fact, pass the butter. But if your neighbor replies, "No thank you," you are quite certain that his impression did not correspond to your

[2] By permission from *The Engineering of Organization and Management,* by Robert T. Livingston. Copyright, 1949. McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc. Pp. 169–170.

expression. There are, of course, many return communications which are ambiguous, in the sense that the communicating individuals cannot be sure as to how close the correspondence is between expression and impression. Nevertheless, there is no way of finding out except by the return communication.

In its simplest form, therefore, communication involves two individuals, at least one of whom is expressing some meaning. These meanings refer to something—to cabbages or kings, to the person expressing the meaning or to the person to whom it is expressed, to other persons, to ideas, or what not. The thing to which the meaning is referred is necessarily perceived by each in some context; there is some sort of ground against which it is figured. And the nature of the perception depends upon the nature of the context, or frame of reference. And so it follows that the meaning expressed and the meaning received can be no more similar than the frames of reference of the expresser and the receiver. Norms, or shared frames of reference, thus make possible the accurate conveying of meaning.

Accurate communication is quite as vital to the man on the street as it is to the logician or the student of semantics. One of the basic facts about human beings is that we are constantly dependent on one another in countless ways. Every human interaction hinges upon the communication of meaning—from casual conversations to such crucial interactions as those involved in bringing up children, loving our friends, or struggling with competitors. Our casual, fleeting motives and our intense, persistent ones depend alike on responses of other people for satisfaction. Communicated meanings are necessary guides to the satisfaction of every such motive. To the extent that communication is inadequate, the guideposts to motive satisfaction point in the wrong direction. Inadequate communication thus leads to disappointment and frustration. .[3]

The mechanical aspects of establishing a communication system must be unified with the system of human relationships unique to each school system. For each organization, school system, or

[3] Theodore M. Newcomb, *Social Psychology,* The Dryden Press, New York, 1950, pp. 291–292.

business corporation, the method by which effective communication is to be established is dependent upon the size, scope of activities, and morale of the personal components comprising the enterprise. The basic objectives of communication are, however, identical for all organizations. Bakke identifies the basic objective as a means of facilitating teamwork to provide for the fulfillment of purpose, and he describes the manner in which this process operates in an organization.

> The basic objective of the communication is, or should be, to facilitate teamwork in line with the fulfillment of the purposes and functions of the organization as a whole, or that subdivision of the organization whose operations are concerned. This is done by action in line with certain subsidiary objectives, e.g., to provide information necessary for effective behavior, to direct or modify that behavior, or to furnish motivation for it. The first is the relevant objective from the point of view of the organization as a whole, although now one, now another of the subsidiary purposes is paramount in connection with particular subjects of communication.
>
> A definition of the terms initiator, recipient, and origin will clarify the concept of route. The initiator is the person who has the authority to initiate or the privilege of initiating the communication. The recipient is the one from whom ultimate comprehension or behavior is expected. The origin is the source of the stimulus leading the initiator to initiate the communication. He may, for instance, be acting after counsel with or in line with decisions of higher authority, as when a department manager issues a communication from his office after a decision of the General Officers' Conference or the president of the union does so after a decision of the Executive Board. In such a case the Conference or Board is the origin, the department manager or the president the initiators. The recipient in this case recognizes that the communication comes to him from the department manager or president, though it may be stimulated by the actions or decisions of other people and may be transmitted to the recipient by intermediaries. The initiator then is that person from whom the recipient recognizes that the message comes in the form he receives it. If the department manager or president had merely acted as a transmitter of information

which the Conference or Board wanted the recipient to receive from the Conference or Board, then the latter are the initiators.

Consider an example. A decision, let us say, is made by the proper authorities that it is necessary to reduce labor costs, and this decision, with instructions to act accordingly, is communicated to the Department Manager. If now an order to reduce labor costs were to go from the department manager to division managers, who then ordered district managers to reduce costs by combining jobs, who then ordered foremen to combine jobs of a particular nature, who then ordered employees to combine jobs in certain ways, the communication to the recipient employees, would come from the initiator foremen and that to the recipient foremen would come from the initiator district manager, etc.

Likewise if employees suggested to the foreman that jobs would be more satisfactory if combined, the foreman suggested to the district manager that jobs could be combined in certain ways, and the district manager suggested to the division manager that jobs of a certain appropriate type should be combined, the employee is the initiator and the foreman the recipient at the first stage, the foreman the initiator and the district manager the recipient at the second stage, etc.

These illustrations are oversimplified for the sole purpose of defining the initiator and recipient. They are not descriptions of the way decisions are made in this company.

In other words, whenever a more general order is made specific to bring it within the scope of authority and responsibility of a subordinate, or of a following person in the work-flow, or a particular suggestion is made in more generalized form to conform with the action appropriate to a superior or to a preceding person in the work-flow, a new communication with a new combination of initiator and recipient is set up. The test of an initiator is whether he has the authority or privilege essential for initiating the communication in the form and degree of specificity in which it comes to the recipient.

The origin in the first example above is the proper authorities; in the second example it is the employee or employees.

The route of the communication is the line of persons within the organization through whom it passes either in process of elaboration from its origin or in process of transmission from initiator to recipient.

If it were transmitted by printed word and distributed by mail, this fact would be noted under media, but the printers and post-office employees would not fall within the definition of "persons within the organization" through whose hands it passed.

Should, however, one of the clerical staff disclose the contents of the communication to a friend or friends, the description of the route would have to include this unauthorized grapevine as well as the line of responsible persons within the organization. Any leak via the employees of an outside organization, such as those of the printing firm, is regarded as sufficiently infrequent to make description unnecessary.

It will be realized that the route may involve no intermediate persons, but go directly from initiator to recipient.

The techniques of communication may be classified as: Media, Language and Composition, and Manner of communicating.

The media may include the spoken word directed either to individuals or groups, and be either face to face or proceed via mechanical instruments; or the written word in the form of memoranda, letters, bulletins, or printed materials.

This feature refers to the type and kind of language and composition rather than to contents.

This feature is of a different order than the others in that it is heavily dependent on the personality traits of the initiator, recipient, and intermediate transmitters. Yet the quality of the human action and reaction in the process is rightfully and necessarily included in any complete description of the system as experienced. Adjectives which might describe the manner of giving would include such words as patient, careful, respectful, quiet, dictatorial, etc., or their opposites. Adjectives which might describe the manner of receiving would include patient, attentive, respectful, interested, grateful, etc., or their opposites.[4]

Simon, in his analysis of the role of communication in the organization, describes it as two-way process through which "decisional premises are transmitted from one member of an organization to another."

[4] E. Wright Bakke, *Bonds of Organization—An Appraisal of Corporate Human Relations,* Harper & Brothers, New York, 1950, pp. 79–82.

Communication may be formally defined as any process whereby decisional premises are transmitted from one member of an organization to another. It is obvious that without communication there can be no organization, for there is no possibility then of the group influencing the behavior of the individual. Not only is communication absolutely essential to organization, but the availability of particular techniques of communication will in large part determine the way in which decision-making functions can and should be distributed throughout the organization. The possibility of permitting a particular individual to make a particular decision will often hinge on whether there can be transmitted to him the information he will need to make a wise decision, and whether he, in turn, will be able to transmit his decision to other members of the organization whose behavior it is supposed to influence.

Communication in organizations is a two-way process: it comprehends both the transmittal *to* a decisional center (i.e. an individual vested with the responsibility for making particular decisions) of orders, information, and advice; and the transmittal of the decisions reached *from* this center to other parts of the organization. Moreover, it is a process that takes place upward, downward, and laterally throughout the organization. The information and orders that flow downward through the formal channels of authority and the information that flows upward through these same channels are only a small part of the total network of communications in any actual organization.

The information and knowledge that has a bearing on decisions arises at various points in the organization. Sometimes the organization has its own "sensory organs"—the intelligence unit of a military organization, or the market analysis section of a business firm. Sometimes individuals are recruited and installed in positions for the knowledge they are presumed already to possess—a legal division. Sometimes the knowledge develops on the job itself—the lathe operator is the first one to know when his machine breaks down. Sometimes the knowledge is knowledge of other decisions that have been made—the executive turns down one request for expenditure of funds because he knows that he has already committed these funds to another use.

In all these cases particular individuals in the organization are pos-

sessed of information that is relevant to particular decisions that have to be made. An apparently simple way to allocate the function of decision-making would be to assign to each member of the organization those decisions for which he possesses the relevant information. The basic difficulty in this is that not all the information relevant to a particular decision is possessed by a single individual. If the decision is then dismembered into its component premises and these allocated to separate individuals, a communication process must be set up for transmitting these components from the separate centers to some point where they can be combined and transmitted, in turn, to those members in the organization who will have to carry them out.[5]

It is easy to subscribe to the idea that communication should be permitted to move up and down through the established channels without many restrictions. To develop free movement, however, requires skill in establishing a permissive organizational climate that will encourage members of the hierarchy to express what they really think, believe, or understand. The very existence of status positions such as assistant principal, principal, supervisor, and superintendent makes it difficult, although not impossible, for accurate communication to be established between teachers and administrators. The tendency exists for persons to keep their errors, misjudgments, and failures hidden and to relate only their successes. Since one's superior may be in a position to recommend or authorize promotions in position and salary, it is not surprising that individuals employ their own censoring of information that is to move up through the channels of communication. Only in an atmosphere which does not threaten the security of the individual can there exist undistorted two-way communication. The influences of superior-subordinate relationships on the process of communication are most vividly described by Gardner.

The line of authority or chain of command is the linkage of subordinates to superiors running from every person at the bottom of the structure to the Big Boss, the man at the top. This provides the series of

[5] Herbert A. Simon, *Administrative Behavior,* The Macmillan Company, New York, 1947, pp. 154–155.

relationships through which the commands of the Big Boss are carried downward through the structure to its most distant points. And it is also up this line that information is carried back to the Big Boss, that he is kept informed as to the progress of the work or of significant occurrences. Thus one of the major functions of the line is that of providing channels of communication extending from top to bottom throughout the structure.

It is not, however, the simple, direct channel of communication that it is often thought to be. By its very nature as a linkage of man-boss relationships, it has a number of peculiarities which affect the quality, accuracy, and speed of its transmission. In fact, much of the transmission is so difficult that it is rare for a superior who is several steps removed from the work level to have a comprehensive knowledge of what goes on in the shop. Such a statement may offend the many top executives who speak with glowing pride of how close they are to the work level, of how their subordinates trust them and tell them all. In any sizeable plant, however, where there are hundreds or even thousands of workers at the bottom, it is obvious that the man at the top cannot possibly be kept informed of every detail. His knowledge of the work situation must be limited to only certain kinds of details or general information. The movement of information from the bottom to the top must be limited, and what goes up must be carefully selected. Ideally only those things are communicated to the Big Boss which are necessary for his decisions or which will help him to perform his special functions. Actually this ideal is rarely achieved, and often important information never arrives at the top, or a lot of small details clutter up the channels.

Although this is a two-way channel with information moving both up and down, there is a striking difference between the kinds of information which go each way. From above comes, "The boss wants to know ," and "The orders are ," while from below comes, "This is what happened ," "These are the difficulties ," and "Here are our successes or our alibis Rare are the occasions when direct demands move up the line from the bottom or explanations for failures move down from the top. (Remember that we are talking about the flow through the line of authority. Other systems of communication will be discussed later.)

The line as a channel of communication has an important function in two kinds of relationships: first, between each person in the structure and his job; and second, between each one and his boss. Probably everyone is aware of the first function and each one does communicate to adjacent levels the obvious things they need to know to do their jobs. Because this function of communication through the line is more or less effective, the system works, people do their jobs, and goods are produced. The second function of line communication is often ignored or misunderstood, however; and because it is overlooked, the man-boss relationship is often so unsatisfactory as to seriously impair efficiency and cooperation.

Because of the nature of the man-boss relationship, because each person is so dependent on his boss for recognition and communication up the line, because each person is so sensitive to his boss' moods, opinions, likes, and dislikes, there is often much confusion and misunderstanding in communication down the line. Since everyone below him is constantly trying to anticipate his wishes, trying to read his every work and gesture, the boss does not always have to put into words his ideas and what he expects of the job. But as a result of this extreme sensitivity to the boss, there are in any work situation frequent misinterpretations, and the problem of impressing the boss sometimes becomes more important than getting the work done.

At the same time, and also because of their sensitivity to the boss and their dependence on him, there is a good deal of distortion of the facts in communicating up the line. Along with a great concern for "giving the boss what he wants," there is a constant tendency to "cover up," to keep the boss from knowing about the things that go wrong or the things that do not get done. No one wants to pass bad news up the line, because he feels that it reflects on him. He is supposed to handle his job so that there is no bad news; he has to give his superiors the impression that he is handling his job efficiently. As a result, he does not go running in to tell the boss what a poor job he did or how stupid he was. That is, he does not unless he thinks some one else will get to the boss first with the story. And when he does have to break some bad news to the boss, he will probably have gotten everything fixed up or developed a good alibi for his failure. In this way people at each level develop methods of defense, often complicated and ingenious, by

means of which they protect themselves from criticism from those above.[6]

Communication channels in an organization are generally thought of as a formal system through which passes information, advice, and orders. In many instances, however, an informal system supplements and even supplants the formal means of transmission. Through the course of social contacts, it is oftentimes possible for a superintendent to institute changes long before a formal directive is issued. On numerous occasions teachers will know about proposed routine changes days before the formal statement of recommendation is distributed. The use of an intentional "leak" in politics to a newspaperman so that public reaction can be appraised is also used by executives to discover reactions to new proposals. Cliques and the "grapevine" are facets of the system of communications developed by the social relationships of the members of the organization. That the executive needs to use the informal communication system and to understand its role in the total scheme of things is the conclusion drawn by Simon.

No matter how elaborate a system of formal communications is set up in the organization, this system will always be supplemented by informal channels. Through these informal channels will flow information, advice, and even orders (the reader will recall that, in terms of our definitions, an authority relation can exist even though the superior is not vested with any sanctions). In time, the actual system of relationships may come to differ widely from those specified in the formal organization scheme.

The informal communications system is built around the social relationships of the members of the organization. Friendship between two individuals creates frequent occasions for contact and "shop talk." It may also create an authority relationship if one of the individuals comes to accept the leadership of the other. In this way "natural leaders" secure a role in the organization that is not always reflected in the organization chart.

[6] Burleigh B. Gardner, *Human Relations in Industry,* Richard D. Irwin, Inc., Chicago, 1945, pp. 24–27.

The informal communication system takes on additional importance when it is remembered that the behavior of individuals in organizations is oriented not only toward the organization's goals but also to a certain extent toward their personal goals, and that these two sets of goals are not always mutually consistent. Hence, when organization members deal with one another, each must attempt to assess the extent to which the other's attitudes and actions are conditioned by personal rather than organizational motives. When a primary relationship has been established between them, it becomes easier for each to make this assessment, and easier for them to be frank in regard to their motives. Requests for cooperation will less often meet with the reaction: "You run your department, and I will run mine."

Primary relationships can be unfriendly, of course, just as easily as they can be friendly, although there is what might be called a "presumption of friendliness" in most social relationships in our society. It becomes a major task of the executives, then, to maintain attitudes of friendliness and cooperation in these direct personal relationships so that the informal communication system will contribute to the efficient operation of the organization rather than hinder it.

The informal communications system is sometimes used by organization members to advance their personal aims. From this arises the phenomenon of cliques—groups that build up an informal network of communications and use this as a means of securing power in the organization. Rivalry among cliques, in turn, may lead to general unfriendliness in social relationships and defeat in purpose of the informal communications system.

There has been little systematic analysis of the way in which the formal organization structure encourages or hinders the formation of cliques, or of the techniques that can be used by executives to deal with cliques and minimize their harmfulness. On the first score, it may be conjectured that weakness of the formal system of communications and failure to secure an adequate measure of coordination through that system probably encourage the development of cliques. The coordinating function that cliques perform under such circumstances is closely analogous to the coordinating function performed by political machines in a highly decentralized governmental structure like the American system.

A great deal of the informal communication in any organization is far less deliberate than the activities of cliques or even the conversations of executives who lunch together. In addition to these there is the great mass of communication that goes under the head of "gossip." In most organizations the "grapevine" probably plays, on the whole, a constructive role. Its chief disadvantages are, first, that it discourages frankness, since confidential remarks may be spread about, second, that the information transmitted by the grapevine is very often inaccurate. On the other hand, in addition to transmitting information that no one has thought to transmit formally, the grapevine is valuable as a barometer of "public opinion" in the organization. If the administrator listens to it, it apprises him of the topics that are subjects of interest to organization members, and their attitudes toward these topics. Even for this latter purpose, of course, the grapevine needs to be supplemented by other channels of information.[7]

III

Hovland indicates that scientific inquiry in the field of communication is of recent origin, and that the field offers a real challenge for practitioner as well as theorist.

Communication as an *art* has had a very long history. The writer, the orator, the public relations counsellor, and the advertiser have been leading practitioners of this art. Communication as a field of scientific inquiry, on the other hand, has been of fairly recent origin. Within the last decade or so, however, there has developed the promise of a genuine science of communication—a systematic attempt to formulate in rigorous fashion the principles by which information is transmitted and opinions and attitudes formed.

The development of this new field has been at least in part a response to the growing urgency of the problem. In industry the increasing concentration of control has widened the gap between workers and management and the feeling has arisen on both sides of the need for more effective intercommunications. The different frames of reference of management and of the worker have intensified this problem.

[7] Herbert A. Simon, *Administrative Behavior,* The Macmillan Company, New York, 1947, pp. 160–162.

The problem of communications is made more challenging by the fact that it is not an area for an isolated specialist. Adequate understanding of the problems of this field depends on a wider variety of talent and range of specialization than almost any other problem in the social sciences. A real science of communication will require the cooperation of both the practitioner and the scientist. Thus the newspaper editor, the radio broadcaster, the movie producer, as well as the psychologist, the sociologist, the anthropologist, and the political scientist have important roles to perform.[8]

School executives face the constant necessity of interpreting the school system to the community, interpreting the community to the system, and solving the problems of internal organizational communication. Each of these problems is not exclusive, since effective communication is a process that permeates downward, upward, and outward. If, for example, the superintendent of schools has succeeded in communicating to the staff the need for interpreting the work of the classroom to parents, then his responsibility in this area has, to some extent, been fulfilled. When, in turn, teachers transmit to the superintendent criticisms of the schools made by parents, the channels of communication serve as a means of keeping the superintendent informed.

Effective communication is needed in a school system to keep individuals informed of the plans, goals, activities, and problems of the enterprise; to insure that each person understands not only his own function, but also the functions of other individuals; to promote healthy morale; to establish a coordinated endeavor; to facilitate the decision-making process; and to provide the means by which constructive action can be taken to alleviate problems and dissatisfactions that arise. Communication is a means of informing, a means of educating, a means of directing; it is the energizing substance that flows through the structure.

[8] Carl I. Hovland, "Social Communication," *Reader in Public Opinion and Communication,* Bernard Berelson and Morris Janowitz (editors), The Free Press, Glencoe, Illinois, 1950, pp. 181–182.

Failure to establish effective communication in a school system has direct and detrimental effects upon the educational process. When poor communication exists between teacher and teacher, teacher and principal, principal and supervisor, principal and superintendent, supervisor and superintendent, and superintendent and school board, the consequences are felt in an inability to secure a coordinated and integrated activity of the components toward a common goal. As individuals fail to understand one another because adequate communication is nonexistent, they tend to act independently and without regard for the welfare of the entire system. The third grade teacher belittles the efforts of the second grade teacher and ignores the responsibility she has toward the fourth grade teacher. If ineffective coordination is ignored and the communication system falters, the result is a gradual rigidity and resistance to change. Since school systems are created by society and must be sensitive reflectors of community need, the conditions described can only lead to a failure by the system to serve the community. When this happens school crises are inevitable.

There are many reasons why the communication system in an organization is ineffective: Indifference of the administrators to the importance of the problem; failure to understand the psychological forces in operation on the members of the organization; wishful thinking by executives that a job will get done by merely ordering it done; proneness not to accept the unpleasant realities of criticism when reported; utilization of autocratic procedures to stimulate democratic results; segmentation of the hierarchy that leads to distrust of the administration; and exploitation of the system for selfish ends. Each of these factors tends to destroy effective communication and when they exist in combination with one another, the results are apt to be disastrous for the organization.

School executives must recognize the importance of establishing a communication system through which orders, directions, suggestions, criticisms, problems, and ideas can freely flow. There must exist a conscious recognition of the problem before the adminis-

trator can succeed in providing an adequate system. Provisions for such a system require that attention be given to the mechanical details involved in establishing routine procedures and to the human beings at each of the routine stops.

There isn't any quick, simple panacea to the problems of developing an effective system of communication; it needs to be an analytical process involving careful study and constant attention. What should appear to be a simple procedure, the issuing of an order, in actual practice is an operation which needs careful attention. The International City Managers' Association in a report on the techniques of municipal administration describes the important principles in issuing orders to gain the maximum results.

1. No order should be issued until it has been determined that the recipient of the order has authority, and the means at his disposal, to carry it out without neglecting other duties which have been imposed on him.

2. Every order must be written in the language best calculated to impress it on the minds (and habits!) of its recipients. An order to day laborers should not be expressed in department-head language. In general, it is impossible to express an order too simply.

3. Every order must be communicated to the persons who are expected to obey it in some fashion which will bring it forcibly to their attention. A bulletin board may be a satisfactory place for certain orders, *if,* the persons affected read the board regularly. Orders should not be expected to trickle down through department heads to their subordinates. If they are intended for all employees, all should generally be supplied with copies.

4. There is a limit (and a very low limit) to the rate at which employees can absorb new orders. Case workers in welfare departments have often been swamped with piles of eligibility rules and "interpretations" of rules, which have remained unread on their desks. An unread order will not be obeyed.

5. If an order is expected to have more than temporary effect, it must be incorporated in some kind of permanent manual available to the persons affected by it, and must be made subject of periodic in-service training procedures.

6. An order is a "last resort." Before issuing an order, the executive should explore all other possible means of bringing about the desired change—particularly in-service training procedures.

7. An order should be thought of as a product to be "sold," and full use should be made of modern advertising techniques. An attractive poster with a three word caption may prove more effective than a precisely worded "directive." The language of soap ads may lack legal precision, but it sells soap.

While this conception of order-giving may reflect an ideal of friendly, cooperative, intelligent administration which cannot always be attained fully in practice, still it sets a goal at which the administrator may well aim. In the first place, subordinate status creates in most men a certain amount of resentment—often in direct proportion to the subordinate's intelligence and initiative. This resentment is minimized when the superior and his subordinate focus their attention on carrying out a joint task—on finding the right solution—instead of concerning themselves with questions of authority and status. This has an equally favorable effect on the superior, for under these circumstances he is not likely to issue a hasty or ill-advised order merely to "show who's boss."

Insofar as the chief administrator can educate his staff to this "best single solution" idea he will find that he has lightened not only his task of direction, but that of coordination as well. For when employees are concentrating on getting a job done, they are in a frame of mind to coordinate spontaneously their activities without indulging in jurisdictional disputes whose only object is to assert authority and maintain prestige.[9]

There are many similarities between the activities of the professional city manager and the school superintendent, and the principles described above would be applicable in each of their areas of administration. The factors which must be considered in issuing orders are the very same factors that need to be considered in all aspects of the communication process.

[9] International City Managers' Association, *The Technique of Municipal Administration,* 3d ed., The International City Managers' Association, Chicago, 1951, pp. 115–117.

Approaches to improving communication can be made in numerous ways. One of the most effective means is through intra-system efforts at self-education. Committees working on problems of common interest provide an ideal means for developing an atmosphere conducive to communicating. When these committees represent different levels in the hierarchy and they function correctly, it is possible to transmit ideas vertically and horizontally without serious distortion. Self-education can be encouraged in many formal ways through manuals, newsletters, bulletins, conferences, and other such techniques. It is important to understand that the more formal procedures will require considerable supplementation.

Recognizing the psychological barriers to communications, the executive promotes opportunities for interdepartmental acquaintanceships, formally and informally. Bowling leagues, dinners, social gatherings, and teas may be used to overcome problems induced by insecurities and resentments that are evident. The informal social aspects of this technique should be reinforced by small group conferences in which two-way communication can be facilitated. More formal means through information polls, orientation programs for new employees, and counseling interviews serve to solidify the gains made by the use of informal techniques.

Successful communication is ultimately determined by the attitude which the executive has toward his role in the organization. The democratic administrator will, through his deeds as well as his words, encourage the process of communication. A democratic organization can only survive if the opportunity exists for the development of friendly interpersonal relationships and the free exchange of ideas. The communication system is the formalized means for insuring the existence of the opportunities.

REFERENCES

APPLEBY, PAUL H., *Big Democracy,* Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., New York, 1945, chap. 6.

BAKKE, E. WRIGHT, *Bonds of Organization,* Harper & Brothers, New York, 1950, chap. 4.

BARNARD, CHESTER I., *Organization and Management,* Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1948, chap. 9.

BERELSON, BERNARD, and JANOWITZ, MORRIS (editors), *Reader in Public Opinion and Communication,* The Free Press, Glencoe, Illinois, 1950.

BERRIEN, F. K., *Comments and Cases on Human Relations,* Harper & Brothers, New York, 1951, chap. 2.

BOGARDUS, EMORY S., *Sociology,* 3d ed., The Macmillan Company, New York, 1949, chap. 15.

BRITT, STEWART H., *Social Psychology of Modern Life,* rev. ed., Rinehart & Company, Inc., New York, 1949, chap. 8.

BROWNELL, BAKER, *The Human Community,* Harper & Brothers, New York, 1950, part IX.

Communications in Modern Society, Report prepared for the University of Illinois, Institute of Communications Research, University of Illinois Press, Urbana, Illinois, 1948, chaps. 1, 5, 6.

DAVIS, RICHARD CURRIER, *Industrial Organization and Management,* Harper & Brothers, New York, 1940, chap. 29.

DIMOCK, MARSHALL E., *The Executive in Action,* Harper & Brothers, New York, 1945, chap. 13.

DUBIN, ROBERT, *Human Relations in Administration,* Prentice-Hall, Inc., New York, 1951, chap. 18.

ELDRIDGE, SEBA *et al., Fundamentals of Sociology,* Thomas Y. Crowell Company, New York, 1950, chap. 19.

GARDNER, BURLEIGH B., and MOORE, DAVIS G., *Human Relations in Industry,* rev. ed., Richard D. Irwin, Inc., Chicago, 1950, chap. 3.

GOLDEN, CLINTON S., and RUTTENBERG, HAROLD J., *The Dynamics of Industrial Democracy,* Harper & Brothers, New York, 1942, chap. 4.

KLUCKHOHN, CLYDE, *Mirror for Man,* McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., New York, 1949, chap. 6.

LIVINGSTON, ROBERT T., *The Engineering of Organization and Management,* McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., New York, 1949, chap. 11.

MARSTON, EVERETT, THOMPSON, LORING M., and ZACHER, FRANK, *Business Communication,* The Macmillan Company, New York, 1949.

Mass Communications, Readings Selected and Edited for the Institute of Communications Research, University of Illinois Press, Urbana, Illinois, 1949, pp. 259–335.

MAYO, ELTON, *The Social Problems of an Industrial Civilization,* Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1945, chap. 1.

MEADOWS, PAUL, *The Culture of Industrial Man,* University of Nebraska Press, Lincoln, Nebraska, 1950, chap. 8.

MILLER, GEORGE A., *Language and Communication,* McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., New York, 1951.

NEWCOMB, THEODORE M., *Social Psychology,* The Dryden Press, New York, 1950, chap. 8.

ROETHLISBERGER, F. J., *Management and Morale,* Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1950, chaps. 6, 7.

SARGENT, S. STANSFELD, *Social Psychology, An Integrative Interpretation,* The Ronald Press Company, New York, 1950, chap. 9.

SIMON, HERBERT A., *Administrative Behavior,* The Macmillan Company, New York, 1947, chap. 8.

SLOTKIN, J. S., *Social Anthropology,* The Macmillan Company, New York, 1950, chap. 12.

TAYLOR, GORDON R., *Are Workers Human?* Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston, 1952, chap. 5.

VILLALON, LUIS J. A. (editor), *Management Men and Their Methods,* Funk & Wagnalls Co., New York, 1949, chap. 24.

WHITE, LEONARD, *Introduction to the Study of Public Administration,* 3d ed., The Macmillan Company, New York, 1948, chap. 15.

CHAPTER IX

The Function of Coordination in Administration

To what extent does unity of purpose enable an organization to achieve coordination?

If divided administrative authority exists is it possible to secure coordinated efforts? What can be done to develop coordination where division of authority exists?

Can an administrator use coercion to secure coordination? How lasting are the results of coordination that have been secured by coercion?

To what extent do cliques in an organization foster or retard coordination? How can cliques be made to work for the benefit of an organization?

Is it possible for all personnel to develop an understanding of unity of purpose? Can individuals translate general organizational objectives to their specific jobs?

What is the place of budget-making in securing coordination of effort? How can the administrator use budget-making procedures to develop unity of purpose?

I

An organization is composed of people—superintendents, directors, principals, engineers, clerks, janitors, and teachers; it requires physical resources—buildings, desks, tables, furnaces, boards, and grounds; it uses materials—pencils, typewriters, machines, paper, and books; and it has purpose—education of children, building of bridges, manufacture of clothes, or selling of toys.

The coordination of people, physical resources, materials, and purpose is the administrator's art. It is the blending of human and physical resources into a harmonious whole which requires the greatest of skill.

Coordination and cooperation are terms that are often used synonymously, and although the words have similar connotations, they are literally different branches of the same tree. In the act of cooperating, groups endeavor to maintain their identity while participating in the solving of problems, implementing an organizational policy, or proposing new courses of action. The identity of the group is considered basic to the survival of the group and oftentimes more important than the reason for cooperating. Cooperative action is, however, one of the effective methods of accomplishment in a democratic social order. Coordination, on the other hand, is action that is designed to overcome the implicit limitations of cooperation by fusing the efforts of the organization to provide for unity of purpose. The perpetuation of the group is not the basis upon which decisions are made or actions are taken. In a coordinated situation individuals and groups will align and realign themselves so as to most effectively work towards the fulfillment of the purpose of the organization. There is nevertheless a direct relationship between cooperation and coordination, for cooperation is needed to secure coordination and coordination is used to encourage cooperation.

It is necessary to coordinate an organization to secure efficiency and stability of operation. Efficiency and stability are measured by production records, wastage, absenteeism, employee morale, and profits secured. The ever-changing organization, the organization subject to spasmodic progress, the organization drifting without plan, the organization with intermittent labor strife, the organization operating with excessive turnover of personnel, and the organization splintered by group self-interest shows the symptoms of being poorly coordinated. It becomes the administrator's task to reduce inefficiency and effect stability by coordinating the efforts

of the organization. Efficiency and stability are not characteristic of the status quo; rather, they are the marks of a forward-moving, dynamic organization confident of the present but looking toward the future.

Every organization harbors forces that tend either to destroy or foster unification of effort. For each positive force there exists a negative force which if nurtured will eat away at the bonds of unity that have been created. The administrator must operate to insure the preservation of those conditions which encourage coordination of effort. If the conditions favorable to unity of action are not present, then the administrator has the opportunity and the challenge of filling the void. There are a number of conditions that can be established which would make such action possible, for example: showing respect for the individual employee, encouraging group planning, providing freely flowing channels of communication, demonstrating democratic leadership, and promoting understanding of purpose.

Many of the methods of stimulating coordination in an organization are planned, however, much of coordination results from informal situational conditioning. Titles such as liaison officer, coordinators, and supervisors are often bestowed upon individuals for the singular purpose of achieving unity of action. Conferences are held, special committees are created, reports are issued, and organizational charts are prepared to assist in the coordinating of the energies of the employed personnel. While there is no doubt that in some situations and under some circumstances coordination does result from such formal action, it is important to recognize the possibilities for coordination that result from informal luncheon arrangements, inter-departmental attacks on common problems, and the local bowling league. The techniques of coordination are dependent upon the specific problem in the specific organization but the need for coordination is generalized for all organizations.

While top-level management is often considered the instigator

of coordination, it would appear that such action must occur at all levels. The superintendent of schools can initiate action that will foster unification, but unless his administrative assistants, assistant superintendents, and principals also serve as kindling points, the original fire will quickly burn itself out. In a democratic organization the effort to coordinate can start at any point and then move laterally as well as vertically. The individual teacher can serve as a focal point around which unity of effort is to be mobilized. Coordination is not the function of a selected group or individual in any organization. It is the responsibility of all individuals and all groups.

Coordination in a democratic society cannot be inspired by coercion. While in some instances groups can be coordinated for short periods of time through pressures which induce fear—reductions in staff, loss of position for unidentified reasons, decrease in salary, jeopardy to tenure rights—the long-range results cannot be lasting or satisfactory. Coordination needs to come about as individuals and groups recognize the part they have to play in the organization and their responsibilities toward the whole enterprise. It cannot exist in an atmosphere of selfishness and group conflict, for under these conditions disunity occurs. Diversification, however, is not to be discouraged to obtain coordinated conformity. The strength of a coordinated organization lies not in conformity but in the ability of its personnel to promote individual and group talents for the benefit of the entire organization.

II

In the relatively simple societal pattern of the pre-industrial revolution period the boast was made by owner-managers that they knew every employee in their organization. While this boast was idle in some organizations, it was probably true in a vast majority of private and public enterprises. It is probably correct that those in the public school administrative hierarchy which came into being in the middle of the nineteenth century did know every em-

ployee in the school organization. As the horse and buggy was replaced by the horseless carriage and a man's shop-barn by a factory, close interpersonal relationships were replaced by complex organizations consisting of many parts with many purposes and employing many persons. Each succeeding year has seen the evolutionary process create bigger organizations—big government, big business, big labor unions, big fraternal organizations, and big school systems. The "bigness" complex has evolved at all governmental levels and in almost all areas of activity. While many individuals advocate a return to the small community and the simple life of bygone years, it is an uncompromisable historical fact that the pages of history cannot be turned back. It is a fact that we must learn to live with now.

Even though the trend be in the direction of "bigness," it should be understood that not all organizations are big nor will the small organization necessarily be consumed by the big ones. Organizations of whatever size, however, are confronted by the necessity of unifying their efforts to insure the greatest efficiency of output. The small consolidated school district with one hundred and fifty pupils, seven teachers, an acting principal, and a teaching superintendent must work harmoniously if the endeavors of the system are to show an educational profit. Large or small, government or private, corporation or school, the organization needs to represent a coordinated effort working to attain common goals. To be successful in organizational enterprises the executive needs to discover the key to coordination. The key, in part, comes from understanding the precise meaning of the term "coordination" as it is applied to the field of administration. One such precise definition has been developed by Newman.

> In administration, coordination deals with synchronizing and unifying the actions of a group of people. A coordinated operation is one in which the activities of the employees are harmonious, dovetailed, and integrated toward a common objective.

Achieving coordination is one of the primary goals of every admin-

istrator. It should not be regarded as a separate and distinct activity, however, because it is a part of all phases of administration. Planning, organization, executive development, direction, and control all should contribute to coordination. To be sure, the efforts of some members of an enterprise may be devoted primarily to securing coordination, but it is fantastic to think that the total task of securing harmonious action can be delegated to a single department. Coordination is a condition that should permeate the administration, rather than one or two devices that may help bring it about.[1]

In Newman's description of coordination there are two essential elements which need to be brought together into harmonious relationships if the organization is to operate efficiently—people and objectives. These basic elements are united by Mooney in what he describes as the first principle of organization.

Organization begins when people combine their efforts for a given purpose. We have shown this by the simple illustration of two people uniting their efforts to lift and move some weighty object. This combination, however, is not the first principle of organization. It is only an illustration of organization itself.

To find the first principle, let us carry the illustration a step further. The efforts of these two lifters must be coordinated, which means that they must act together. If first one lifted, and then the other, there would be no unity of action, and hence no true organization of effort. Coordination first appeared in organization when one of those hairy, slow-witted ancestors of ours assumed authority and gave the guttural equivalent of "Heave ho!" *Here, then, we find the first principle of organization.*

Coordination, therefore, is the orderly arrangement of group effort, to provide unity of action in the pursuit of a common purpose.[2]

Recognizing the two basic elements as people and objectives, however, still leaves us short of achieving a coordinated effort. There still needs to be a concerted effort made to bring the two

[1] William H. Newman, *Administrative Action,* Prentice-Hall, Inc., New York, 1951, p. 390.

[2] James D. Mooney, *The Principles of Organization,* Harper & Brothers, New York, 1939, p. 5.

elements together. In a school system there exist students, teachers, custodians, principals, supervisors, secretaries, and a superintendent as well as other personnel. The school system has goals that can be described in terms of understandings, skills, appreciations, attitudes, interests, and abilities. Knowing of the existence of each of the elements does not alone produce a coordinated effort. What is needed is specific action that will foster a unified system. Livingston indicates that the bringing of people and purpose together is a fundamental problem of organization for the administrator.

The problem of organization is to fit together a number of work units and departments into the best possible larger unit. The various divisions are intended to operate together, some sequentially, others as service units. Organization implies the best possible design of all the units combined rather than the best possible design of the units individually. In a word, organization includes coordination.

The problem of any association is very similar. Each unit has a function and must be designed to perform it. But it also must be designed to perform that function in relation to every unit with which it is in contact and in relation to the whole. This is coordination.

Coordination is the interrelating factor of organization. It is not difficult to organize a single activity, but to organize several into a single entity is a worthy accomplishment. Coordination is that which makes organization "good." It is the system of balances and checks, of stimuli and responses, that exists between and among the units of an association.

Every process must be coordinated, for a process is a series of sequential operations and actions: operations pertaining to machines, actions to people. Coordination determines and provides for the proper relation of these actions and operations, one with another, with the whole, with the environment, and upon the occasion. Areas of specific responsibility and delegated authority must be established, defined and balanced.[3]

[3] By permission from *The Engineering of Organization and Management,* by Robert T. Livingston. Copyright, 1949. McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc. Pp. 168–169.

This, then, is the nature of coordination—the uniting of people and purpose in an organization that permits optimum growth in the most efficient manner. This statement, however, represents a general description of the concept of coordination. To know it intimately the general description must be described in concrete terms. Sears offers a descriptive analysis of the function of coordination in an educational enterprise.

In administration one is dealing with people; with materials in endless variety; with educational purposes and programs; with children and parents; with the government; and with various physical, social, scientific, and economic forces. To carry on a school system requires a wide variety of activities, in which these various people, materials, interests, and forces each plays a part. The function of keeping each person, item of material, purpose, program, activity, interest, and force in its place and so attuned to all the others that together they form a unified, going educational enterprise is the function of coordination.

One could be working at coordination as one of his purposes even though he might be engaged in planning or in organizing or in directing or in controlling, as his primary concern at the time. As one plans a budget, he must think of timing the collection to the spending of the funds, and the amounts of money provided in each case must match the estimated cost of the items of service or material they are to pay for. Budgeting is planning to have this desired harmony of relationship. Similarly, in directing, one does not give an order without careful thought of the various things that may be affected by it. In preparing the schedules for cleaning rooms, one cannot ignore the schedule of instruction. Again, in organizing, the size and assignments of staff are decided in terms of other things—the numbers of pupils, the instructional requirements, and the funds, the kind and amount of housing, and the instructional equipment available for use. In the field of administrative control, it is the same. An audit of the school funds is a checking of spending over against the budget and the income by sources, to determine whether income and expense are properly related to each other, not only as to amounts, but also as to use. The budget is both a collection of figures on income and expense and a plan or pro-

gram of management for the schools. To control the funds, it is important to check expense against the program carried out as to check it against income. Thus coordination is, in fact, an aspect or a phase of each of the other major forms of administrative activity.[4]

To achieve the coordinated effort that has been described above it is necessary to understand the factors that influence the extent to which it can be achieved in an organization. These factors can be identified as: (1) unity of purpose, (2) organizational control, (3) organizational size, (4) time, and (5) communication. Organizations are described as single purpose or multipurpose, the designation being established on the basis of what the organization is trying to achieve. An organization such as a shoe manufacturing corporation has the single purpose of producing and distributing its product; an organization such as one of the major meat packing corporations has many purposes in addition to that of packing meat for the market. The school system is a single-purpose organization in that its primary job is the education of the young people of society. It must be recognized that this purpose has been expanded to include adult education, hot lunch programs, bus transportation, summer camping, and many other activities. Primarily, however, the basic responsibility of the public school systems of the United States is the *education* of the young people in society. To accomplish this purpose the community employs administrators, teachers, maintenance workers, nurses, secretaries, and others—to teach, keep records, repair boilers, check the health of children, and maintain the school. Boards of education appoint administrative officers who are delegated the responsibility for insuring unity of purpose. Whether the organization is single purpose or multipurpose, the same responsibility exists for the administrators. Unity of purpose represents the ideational factor that influences the success with which the executive achieves coordination. The significance of

[4] By permission from *The Nature of the Administrative Process,* by Jesse B. Sears. Copyright, 1950. McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc. Pp. 162–163.

unity of purpose in organizations is carefully considered by Mooney.

Coordination implies an aim or objective. But it does not follow, even where is a true mutual interest, a mutual understanding, and a degree of mutual participation, that each and every member of the organization does in fact carry in his mind a deep understanding of the objective and how it may be attained. Among the higher officials, those who are responsible for results, this understanding should be ever present. They should know, furthermore, that the more this understanding seeps down through all ranks and grades, until all are permeated with it, the greater will be the coordinated effort and the greater the strength of the organization for the accomplishment of its purpose. It is the necessary means to this end that brings us in contact with the significant word "doctrine."

To most people this word has a religious flavor, and well it may, for, of all forms of organization, religious associations are the ones that are most deeply imbued with its spirit. But the word itself has a broader meaning. We see this illustrated in the various applications of the title "doctor," which means simply the teacher, representative, or practitioner of a doctrine. There is, indeed, a doctrine for every conceivable form of collective human effort.

Doctrine in the primary sense means the *definition of the objective.* In religious associations this doctrine is based on faith, as formally stated in the *creed.* In industrial organizations it is the attainment of a *surplus through service.* In governmental organization we find different and constantly changing doctrines, but always a doctrine of some sort, however varied its interpretations by the leaders and statesmen of history. In this primary sense doctrine is synonymous with the objective.

When we consider, however, the *procedure necessary to attain the objective* we encounter the secondary meaning of the word, which it seems a misnomer to call secondary, for it often transcends the primary meaning in practical importance. This fact the following examples will show.

With a physician or surgeon the doctrine of the objective is obvious. It is to make the patient well. But the doctrine of procedure and its ap-

plication call for a thorough training and wide experience. Likewise, the doctrine of the military objective is simple. According to the school of Foch and Napoleon, it is the forcing of a decision through the overthrow of the adversary. The necessary procedure, however, constitutes a highly technical art, in which all the principles of military strategy and tactics are involved.

This point is vital in all forms of coordinated effort. Always there is sure to be a doctrine of procedure of some kind, but it is not enough to have such a doctrine, nor is it sufficient for the doctrine to be a sound one. Above all, it is essential that this doctrine shall, in the popular phrase, be "sold" to everyone concerned. Every member of an organization should not only know its doctrine, but he should feel it and absorb it until he lives in its atmosphere and makes it the guide of all his acts.

A doctrine of procedure does not mean a body of set rules that must be accepted as though they were articles of faith. We shall presently discuss more broadly the distinction between rules and principles in organization. "Indoctrination" in the military sense means simply the inculcation of those principles which serve as the guide of the military man, whatever the situation he is compelled to face.

To find a simpler illustration of unity of doctrine, and its necessity in the attainment of any group objective, we may turn to the field of sports, such as our national games of baseball and football, where groups are competing and where success in the attainment of the purpose depends on coordinated effort. In these sports there is a real functional differentiation of duties. In the formal sense, however, the problems of organization are all predetermined by the rules of the game. The primary objective also is so simple that the shortest word will state it. It is to *win.*

When we come, however, to procedure, in other words, to the means necessary to win, we find emerging in each case a real doctrine which accounts for the high importance of the baseball manager and the football coach. Tracing each doctrine through all the intricacies of baseball and football strategy we find that it rests, as it must, on the first principle of organization, namely, coordination of effort. This coordination, so essential to victory in any sport where a number of players combine their efforts for a common purpose, has given us the splendid word "teamwork."

Another illustration in a different sphere is the coordination of a symphony orchestra. Here the purpose is the production of a collective harmony, not as a means to an end but as an end in itself. To attain this end each individual musician merges himself in the common purpose. Functionalism in an orchestra is as varied as the nature of the different instruments. In the orchestra these individual functions derive their importance solely from their contribution to the common purpose, and the relation of each muscian's function to this purpose is ever present in the instant result. This fact of the objective resulting instantly from the initial coordination makes the orchestra the supreme symbol and the simplest illustration of a coordinated effort.[5]

The second factor which influences coordination is the organizational control that exists through structure. This is a problem of putting the parts of the organization together so that the entire operation will be synchronized. It is a job of placing individuals in positions so that delegation can be effected and control maintained. It is the recognition that individuals do have limits to their span of actual control and that subdivisions within the organization must be created. White has pointed out that the concept of span of control is important in all organizational activities and that, in general, in the area of public administration excessive demands have been made upon the chief executive.

In any complex organism the parts have to work in coordination with each other in order to produce useful results. In a mechanical device, the machine stalls if its parts do not gear together; in an organism the consequence of imperfect coordination is reduced efficiency. Coordination is the adjustment of the functions of the parts to each other, and of the movement and operation of parts in time so that each can make its maximum contribution to the product of the whole.

The coordination of the great number of parts of any large-scale organization is so important that the industrialists Mooney and Reiley make it the center of their analysis. Effective coordination is an absolute essential to good administration, and is a direct responsibility of

[5] James D. Mooney, *The Principles of Organization,* Harper & Brothers, New York, 1939, pp. 10–13.

overhead management. It is effected primarily by the orders, directions, and commands of the chief executive, but long experience has demonstrated the need for supplementary means of coordination. Conferences of high executives under the chairmanship of the chief executive, and of their subordinates, interdepartmental committees, and specialized coordinating agencies are common devices. A staff is an effective coordinating organ, since its studies make it familiar with the consequences of poor coordination, and it can suggest means of correction to the chief executive. Sound organization itself is conducive to easy coordination; as Mooney has suggested, there is a coordination of jobs which precedes the coordination of men.

The limits of coordination and supervision by one individual are suggested in the phrase "span of control," a derivative of the psychological term, "span of attention." This phrase refers to the obvious fact that there are limits to human capacity, and that when attention is spread too thinly over too many circumstances, unsatisfactory results occur. Graicunas has set forth the rapidly developing potential number of personal combinations which may prevail between one supervisor and an increasing number of subordinates. Fortunately not all of these potential combinations actually emerge, at least to the point where they require attention on the part of the supervisor.

The maximum number of subordinates who can be effectively supervised by one supervisor cannot be precisely determined by the application of a "law" of the span of attention. The effective span of attention varies with the type of work supervised (whether routine or discretionary), with the level of responsibility, with the personalities of the supervisor and subordinates, and with the necessary degree of supervision and direction. In general the structure of public administration has been such as to impose excessive tasks of direction and supervision upon the chief executive. A personnel and information service conducted with imagination may relieve the excessive task of the chief executive by bringing the whole personnel into awareness of the objectives and achievements of the department and thus create a sense of corporate sharing that not only simplifies but perhaps itself constitutes successful coordination.[6]

[6] Leonard White, *Introduction to the Study of Public Administration,* 3d ed., The Macmillan Company, New York, 1948, pp. 36–38.

White recognizes the importance of placing individuals in the correct place in an organization, but he does not elaborate on the role which the informal social structure has on this problem. Gardner, in his studies of the existence of informal social structure in factories, indicates that to achieve a coordinated effort it is necessary to take into account the various personal interrelationships that exist.

A factory is a co-ordinated enterprise directed to the production of goods within certain limits of price and quality. It is also a complex social system, variously segmented, in which each individual has a certain place, each has certain functions and activities, and each achieves certain rewards and satisfactions. The functions, positions, and satisfactions of all the individuals are interrelated and interdependent, and all are ultimately part of the productive enterprise. It is important that all the roles of all the individuals be co-ordinated so that each is adjusted to the needs of the organization as a whole, and for maximum efficiency it is necessary to have a high degree of willing co-operation between individuals and between groups.

Many instances of poor co-operation have been cited in the course of this discussion, and there has been an implication throughout that certain situations, certain policies, and some types of organization discourage co-operation and teamwork. Because the need for effective co-operation is so great, and because the factors which encourage it are so often misunderstood, it seems advisable to review some of these points and to relate them specifically to the problem of co-operation. At first glance, the problem of getting everyone in a factory to co-operate together for the good of the whole seems an overwhelming task. With our structural picture of the factory as a social organization, however, it is possible to point out four particular spots, four kinds of relationships, which may be seen as the keys to effective co-operation in industry. These are (1) relations within the work group, (2) relations between the group and its boss, (3) relations between groups, and (4) relations between different levels from top to bottom. A maximum of efficiency and teamwork in these four spots is almost an absolute pre-

requisite for maximum efficiency in the production of goods and for maximum employee satisfaction.[7]

The third and fourth factors which influence coordination are size and time. It can readily be understood that the problems of coordination become relatively more complex as the organization grows larger. More people, more departments, more levels in the hierarchy combine to create more problems of coordination. These problems exist because of the mathematical magnitude of the organization, and they exist because it takes more time to secure the understanding and support of one thousand employees than it does of ten. The factors of time and size as elements in the problem of coordination have been described by Gulick.

Size and time are the great limiting factors in the development of co-ordination. In a small project, the problem is not difficult; the structure of authority is simple, and the central purpose is real to every worker. In a large complicated enterprise, the organization becomes involved, the lines of authority tangled, and there is danger that the workers will forget that there is any central purpose, and so devote their best energies only to their own individual advancement and advantage.

The interrelated elements of time and habit are extraordinarily important in co-ordination. Man is a creature of habit. When an enterprise is built up gradually from small beginnings the staff can be "broken in" step by step. And when difficulties develop, they can be ironed out, and the new method followed from that point on as a matter of habit, with the knowledge that that particular difficulty will not develop again. Routines may even be mastered by drill as they are in the army. When, however, a large new enterprise must be set up or altered overnight, then the real difficulties of co-ordination make their appearance. The factor of habit, which is thus an important foundation of coordination when time is available, becomes a serious handicap when time is not available, that is, when change rules. The question of co-

[7] Burleigh B. Gardner, *Human Relations in Industry,* Richard D. Irwin, Inc., Chicago, 1945, p. 272.

ordination therefore must be approached with different emphasis in small and in large enterprises; in simple and in complex situations; in stable and in new or changing organizations.[8]

Tead agrees that size is a major problem which tends to develop a need for coordination, but he also points out another factor which needs to be considered—communication.

As organizations increase in arithmetic size, their difficulties of administrative cohesion grow in geometric proportion. For as size increases, the inevitable functional divisions become larger and more separated, both geographically and in points of view about the results desired and about how to get them. Obviously, to pull together in an over-all directive way the activities of production, sales, finance and personnel is one thing in a group of a couple of hundred people. It will require the effort of but a handful of people. But if the corporate group is two thousand or twenty thousand, the job of bringing some organic unity both of intention and of activities attains a magnitude which requires a high order of intellectual capacity. This capacity has to do with two interdependent factors, first, a structuring of the required personal and group relations, and, second, the states of mind of numerous individuals who are more effective if beyond preoccupation with their own restricted tasks they can have some cogent view of the whole enterprise in action.

The term "coordination" will here identify this vital function and process of strengthening these necessary interrelationships. Coordination has to do with the administrative effort to help formulate, adopt, transmit, give effect to, interpret and oversee the policies of the organization. Its distinctive focus is upon successful understanding and willing agreement to *proposed* new policy ideas and upon unified, interlocking efforts continuously to have accepted aims and policies well carried out. The focus is upon provisions for the smooth working of the organization *as a whole,* beyond that of each of its functional parts, and upon the fostering of personal outlooks which facilitate a unified result.

The ramifications of this effort require deliberate attention to the

[8] Luther Gulick, "Notes on the Theory of Organization," *Papers on the Science of Administration,* Institute of Public Administration, New York, 1937, p. 6.

flow of communication and agreement *down and up and across* in the organization. This includes concurrence among major staff executives, among major and supervisory operating managers, among the necessary staff officers, and between them and line officers, within rank-and-file groups, and between all of these and managerial members at lower and higher levels. The need is for active and explicit communication which produces fertilization of ideas and united action among interdependent groups and individuals.[9]

In the preceding pages of this section the importance of achieving coordination in an organization has been described by those interested in the administration of the respective fields of business, government, and education. Experts in each of these areas have examined the problem and have pointed out what to them have been significant factors which affect the problem. It is evident that the problems share common elements which are to a large extent identical for all executives. Not only are the problems similar but the means for alleviating the problems are also identical. Sears proposes that in order to affect coordination it is necessary to engage in three types of activities—diagnosis, prescription, and execution.

The process of coordination, as actual administrative work, divides naturally into three types of activity—diagnosis, prescription, and execution. In administration one finds out what is wrong in a case, or what will be required in a case yet to be developed, in order that he may be able to correct the weakness or, in the new case, to forestall weaknesses. Thus, diagnosis is the first stage and prescription, the second stage of this type of administrative activity. Only upon completion of these two can one deal with the final step, which is to give effect to the plan.

The nature of these three forms of activity can be seen by considering what they involve and how one might proceed in carrying them out.

The work of diagnosis would seem to include the following:

[9] By permission from *The Art of Administration,* by Ordway Tead. Copyright, 1951. McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc. Pp. 179–180.

1. Discovery of the case—as an existing breakdown, or a need for a new relationship to be developed.
2. Location of case, as to what services, programs, purposes, processes, are to be coordinated.
3. Analysis of weaknesses when the case is one of poor or broken-down relationships; or of needs, when it is in anticipation of relationships later to be established.
4. Objectives to be supported or attained by the coordination.
5. Determination of personnel involved or to be involved, with alterations in organization and in assignments.
6. The bases with respect to which relationships must be worked out in the case—time, place, activities, etc.
7. The forces or forms of power required to effect the coordination —authority, knowledge, social usage, personal traits, will, taste, friendliness.
8. The relation of the coordinating activity in the case to the planning, the organizing, the directing, and the controlling processes of administration.
9. The need for supplies, equipment, and housing, as means to effect the coordination.
10. Outcomes expected, with possible difficulties or dangers to be met.

Prescription, as the second stage in the process of coordination, must try to anticipate the problems of execution, which would seem to include the following:

1. Have a clear understanding of all that is shown by the diagnosis.
2. Know what relationships are to be effected in a new case or altered in an existing situation.
3. Outline definite ways and means for effecting the development of the change.
4. Give careful consideration to the effects anticipated, making sure that they will facilitate or lead toward the desired relationships.

These four steps or aspects of the task of prescription complete the planning part of coordination. The next and final move, that of put-

ting the results of this work into effect, brings us to coordination as a phase of the directing process. Here, the proposed plan is empowered and the changes are put into effect. Direction orders the changes required, but as the changes are to produce coordination, the director shapes his orders or instructions with careful respect to the effects they may have upon this final outcome. In so far as his actions are motivated by coordination needs, to that extent direction and coordination go on together, the latter being the objective of the former.[10]

It is generally agreed by specialists in the field of administration, theorist and practitioner alike, that the primary way to coordinate an enterprise is through the establishment of a desire by individuals to achieve a definite purpose. Production figures that were considered impossible to achieve in the pre-Pearl Harbor days became springboards for continually increasing production records. Students in classrooms, soldiers in the field, workers in the factories, and clerks in offices when motivated by a common purpose can achieve unity of action without the necessity for stimulating them through artificial means. Mooney describes this process as the development of a "community of interest" which is achieved when all of the members of an organization understand each other, understand the purpose of the organization, and understand how they as individuals and groups contribute to the achievement of the purpose.

Community of interest is the legitimate basis of every organization. In searching for its psychic fundaments we find that it can mean only *mutuality of interests.* This in turn implies mutual duties, which means the obligation to *mutual service.* This obligation is universal, transcending, therefore, the sphere of organization. As expressed in the ancient Roman juridical maximum *do ut des* (I give that thou mayest give), it is the manifest basis of all human relations.

In a special sense, however, it has an application within the sphere or organization. Here it is the moral phase of the principle of coordi-

[10] By permission from *The Nature of the Administrative Process,* by Jesse B. Sears. Copyright, 1950. McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc. Pp. 195–197.

nation. It is for this reason that organizations of all kinds, whether governmental, religious, military, or industrial, furnish our best human examples of the spirit of mutual service.

Although the formal technique of organization has, until recent years, received but scant attention, the humanistic phases of organization have an extensive literature. In this literature the obligation to mutual service is called by various names, among them cooperation, integration, functional relating, and integrated functioning. All these terms suggest the formal as well as the human side of coordination, which shows how impossible it is to separate them. We must keep in mind that organizations are the creations of people, and hence that everything that is formal in organized forms must rest on psychic fundaments.

A true coordination must be based on a real community of interest in the attainment of the desired object. It is equally true that a community of interest that is real, not only in the objective sense but likewise in everybody's consciousness, can come only through a real community of understanding. This means not merely that administration and members must understand each other, but that each and all must understand what the real purpose is and, furthermore, that every group represented in the organization must understand how and why the attainment of this purpose is essential to the welfare of all.[11]

While community of interest can be engendered by a crisis such as the outbreak of war, under more normal circumstances this commonness of purpose results through the direct action of a leader. In recent years this has been evident in nations with diametrically opposite political philosophies—Stalin in the U.S.S.R. and Roosevelt in the United States, Hitler in Germany and Churchill in England. Each of these individuals, operating from different philosophical premises, had through their personal leadership been able to achieve a coordinated effort in organizational enterprises as large as their respective nations. It can only be hoped that in our society the leaders will use democratic means for democratic ends

[11] James D. Mooney, *The Principles of Organization,* Harper & Brothers, New York, 1939, pp. 8–9.

to achieve necessary coordination of effort. The role of leadership in promoting coordination is described by Urwick.

> Co-ordination is an activity that cannot be separated from the functions and responsibility of the leader. It is a continuous process, a constant responsibility. It cannot be fulfilled wholly by units in committee form, which are by definition intermittent in operation. It is logical to anticipate an increased specialisation of the leader's duty of co-ordination through subordinates associated with him in a "staff" relationship.
>
> The aim of co-ordination is a psychological unit, an integration, not only of arrangements, but of will and enthusiasm. No apparatus, no mechanisms or structural devices can ensure the things of the spirit. The way in which the leader approaches questions, seeks to interpret his mind to those he leads, must have a profound bearing on this issue.[12]

To achieve coordination, executives must build through proper structural organization. While it is possible to prepare ideal tables of organization which fail to produce the desired results, it is just as common to produce failures because an appropriate table of organization does not exist. Given the proper formal organization, it becomes easier for the executive to exert the leadership that produces unity of action. The executive has the responsibility for establishing the organization that will enable him to carry out his responsibilities.

There exists yet another way by which coordination can be achieved: through the exercise of authority upon individuals and groups. Authority has become synonymous with authoritarianism and this has induced some confusion in the minds of individuals seeking to practice democratic administration. Authority in a democratic organization is delegated power which is given to individuals by the group for the maximum benefit of all concerned. Through the use of such authority it becomes possible to assign re-

[12] L. Urwick, *The Elements of Administration,* Harper & Brothers, New York, 1943, p. 76.

sponsibilities and prescribe duties. In school organizations the community delegates certain powers to the superintendent through the school board, and in turn the superintendent uses his position of authority to secure a coordinated effort. The danger in the use of authority is that individuals may seek to exercise it for their own selfish interests and in this way become authoritarian. Simon more fully examines this concept.

Administrative activity is group activity. Simple situations are familiar where a man plans and executes his own work; but as soon as a task grows to the point where the efforts of several persons are required to accomplish it this is no longer possible, and it becomes necessary to develop processes for the application of organized effort to the group task. The techniques which facilitate this application are the administrative processes.

It should be noted that the administrative processes are decisional processes: they consist in segregating certain elements in the decisions of members of the organization, and establishing regular organizational procedures to select and determine these elements and to communicate them to the members concerned. If the task of the group is to build a ship, a design for the ship is drawn and adopted by the organization, and this design limits and guides the activities of the persons who actually construct the ship.

The organization, then, takes from the individual some of his decisional autonomy, and substitutes for it an organization decision-making process. The decisions which the organization makes for the individual ordinarily (1) specify his function, that is, the general scope and nature of his duties; (2) allocate authority, that is, determine who in the organization is to have power to make further decisions for the individual; and (3) set such other limits to his choice as are needed to coordinate the activities of several individuals in the organization.

Group behavior requires not only the adoption of correct decisions, but also the adoption by all members of the group of the same decisions. Suppose ten persons decide to cooperate in building a boat. If each has his own plan, and they do not communicate their plans, the

chances are that the resulting craft will not be very seaworthy; they would probably meet with better success if they adopted even a very mediocre design, and if then all followed this same design.

By the exercise of authority or other forms of influence, it is possible to centralize the function of deciding so that a general plan of operations will govern the activities of all members of the organization. This coordination may be either procedural or substantive in nature: by procedural coordination is meant the specification of the organization itself—that is, the generalized description of the behaviors and relationships of the members of the organization. Procedural coordination establishes the lines of authority and outlines the sphere of activity of each organization member, while substantive coordination specifies the content of his work. In an automobile factory, an organization chart is an aspect of procedural coordination; blueprints for the engine block of the car being manufactured are an aspect of substantive coordination.[13]

Mooney has summed up the problem of coordination by stating the need for the development of individual creativity.

We have defined coordination as the orderly arrangement of group effort to provide unity of action in the pursuit of a common purpose. This working together demands the use of the full capacity, mental and physical, of each individual, complete operating order, and adaptability to meet the changes in surrounding circumstances. Consequently, the main problem in modern industry is the decentralization of command through line delegation and the encouragement of individual initiative, even in the smaller units of command. This must be achieved on some basis that ensures complete coordination in the movement to a common purpose.[14]

III

The public school system in the United States at the present time was not created through intentional design, rather it has

[13] Herbert A. Simon, *Administrative Behavior,* The Macmillan Company, New York, 1947, pp. 9–10.

[14] James D. Mooney, *The Principles of Organization,* Harper & Brothers, New York, 1939, p. 173.

evolved through adaptation to meet changing social and economic conditions. In the course of American educational history the structure has taken shape as the result of such divergent influences as the Latin grammar schools, Dame schools, the German *Volksschulen,* Horace Mann, Henry Barnard, and John Dewey. This adaptative process, as described by Edwards and Richey, has been designed to bring the public school system in harmony with the democratic ideal of equal educational opportunity.

The structural organization of the school system of the United States has evolved from origins inherited from Europe. In the progress of its development it has reflected changes in American life, changes in the aims, and purposes of the school as conceived by succeeding generations, and changes in points of view concerning the extent to which an adequate education should be provided for all.

In general, the trend has been toward reorganization in harmony with the democratic ideal of equal educational opportunity. In the process, all levels of education have been affected. Both elementary and secondary education were redefined and extended, and, in order that the benefits deriving from their extension be more equitably distributed, attempts were made to standardize elementary and secondary education —to promote a reasonable measure of uniformity in the programs of schools of like grade. The college was so reorganized as to change it from an aristocratic, religious, linguistic, and highly selective institution into one for the education of a much-enlarged student body which was becoming increasingly heterogeneous in ability, educational background, cultural interests, and vocational aims.

The earliest American educational institutions differed little from their European prototypes. The early colonial colleges and the transplanted secondary schools—the Latin grammar schools—were established largely for the purpose of training a religious leadership. Historically, they had no connection with the common elementary schools originally organized to provide a very modest academic training for a class of children not represented in or aspiring to college. The relation of the college to the secondary school was not organic, but since the

Latin school directed its efforts, in the main, toward preparing boys for collegiate study, a form of articulation and a basis for closer relationship did exist. Together these schools formed a single system and performed a well-defined function, but between them and the elementary schools which performed a totally different function, there was no connecting link.

The development of a democratic system of education involved the uprooting of this aristocratic dual system, the expansion of curricula, the creation of new and the modification of old administrative units, the development of standards, the establishment of a measure of uniformity throughout the land, and the articulation of the units at the various levels into a well-integrated whole. In the process time-honored and well-defined institutions were replaced by a variety of new ones—generally ill-defined and more often than not of poor quality. The more or less uniform practices of the traditional system gave way to a multiplicity of practices, some good and some only expedient. It was in the confusion resulting from the breakup of the old class system of education that the integrated uniform system of modern education had its beginning.[15]

The integrated system that has evolved is commonly thought of as a pattern of grades commencing with the kindergarten and going through the twelfth grade. Within this basic framework there exist many organizational patterns such as K-6-3-3, K-8-4, K-6-4-2, and K-7-3-2. Proposals for upward and downward extension of this pattern have been made and in some systems the downward extension has included a junior kindergarten or a preschool nursery program and the upward extension has included a Junior or Community College for grades thirteen and fourteen. This pattern of organization does not take into account the increasing number of adult education programs and summer camping and recreational programs which have developed in recent years.

[15] Newton Edwards and Herman G. Richey, *The School in The American Social Order*, Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston, 1947, pp. 806–808.

While to all paper appearances this is a relatively simple structural pattern, in actual practice it is a highly segmented and departmentalized organization. At the primary-grade levels where self-contained classroom units are the rule rather than the exception, the atomistic nature of the structure is almost nonexistent. As one moves up the educational scale, however, segmentation of effort is apparent from one grade level to another and within each grade level the program is broken up into self-interest departments. The problem becomes magnified at particular breaking points, such as when the student moves from the elementary grades to the junior high school and from the junior high school to the senior high schools. The extent of this atomization is dependent upon the size of the school system and the extent to which the personnel recognize segmentation and departmentalization as a problem of major importance.

For the school administrator the problem of segmentation and departmentalization of effort becomes a problem of coordination. There are four reasons why the problems need to be solved: (1) The necessity for organizing a unified effort that will assist the young people to progress satisfactorily toward the educational goals which have been established for them by society. (2) The necessity of securing articulation between grades and school units so that the program can be accomplished with a minimum of confusion and loss to the students. (3) The necessity for promoting an integration of effort at all grade levels, to reinforce learning. For example, outlining as taught by the English teachers is used by the science and social studies teachers, and American history becomes integrated into the language arts program and the science sequence. (4) The necessity for providing for maximum educational development through the use of continuity and properly planned sequences. Each of these reasons for developing a coordinated public school system has to do with the educational program, and that is as it should be, however, the efforts of the staff or auxiliary agencies that are a fundamental part of the school sys-

tem must also be coordinated with the efforts of those most directly concerned with the teaching process.

The failure to achieve a coordinated school system results in ineffective learning, poor personnel morale, and severe public criticisms. The results of poor coordination are known, but the causes are not as often recognized. Some of the major causes of ineffective coordination in the public schools are: failure to adequately define the goals of the school system in terms of all-school and classroom objectives; failure to understand the personal motivations of individuals and groups in the organization; failure to provide a formal organization which facilitates coordination; failure to develop channels of communication vertically (upwards as well as down) and horizontally; failure to recognize level and departmental self-interest; and failure to use democratic practices while espousing democratic theories. Each of these generalizations could be analyzed for specific causes leading to organizational disintegration, and that is a task for the school executive if the goals to be achieved by unified action are considered worthy of attainment.

There isn't any one sure way for achieving coordination of effort, rather there are many ways through which the executive can proceed. One of the most effective ways of achieving coordination is through developing a feeling for the unity of purpose of the organization. Public schools do have goals which are important for society and these goals should be understood, appreciated, and applied by all members of the organization. A public school system's educational policy should be developed by the community, the administrative staff, the professional personnel, and all others concerned with the welfare of society, and this policy should be translated into specific terms for all teachers at all grade levels so that the individual sees his role in relation to the total pattern. It is important psychologically, not alone educationally, that the individual discover how his efforts are making a contribution to the efforts of the total organization. The school administrator must be the moving force which makes the study of educational policy a dy-

namic action rather than placid acceptance of a prepared prescription.

Coordination can be furthered by providing adequate staff personnel to work at all levels in the school system. The supervisor of the language arts or any other field should be in a position to consider all aspects of the program from the kindergarten through the secondary school level. The supervisors should also be in the position of seeing the interrelationships which exist at all grade levels.

Still another way of promoting coordination is through the use of committees that cut across grade, age, and school levels. Opportunities through action research committees that consider basic school problems are means of stimulating mutual understanding among staff members. Junior high school teachers should know what textbooks the elementary school teachers are using, and the elementary school teachers should know what textbooks the senior high school teachers are using. The custodians should understand the problems of the teachers and the teachers should understand the problems of the custodians. Informal as well as formal opportunities need to be provided so that the possibilities for coordination are enhanced.

The one indispensable requirement for securing coordination in a public school system is democratic leadership. Coordination can be autocratically imposed in a society which subscribes to an authoritarian set of values. In our society the schools have a responsibility for subscribing to democratic ideals even if they are imperfectly practiced by society. This subscription applies equally for administrators as it does for teachers. The democratic leader who recognizes the potential creativity of each individual seeks to develop a school system environment in which the individual can grow. Individuals do not always work alone and the democratic leader strives to encourage group action wherever and whenever necessary. Coordination takes place as individuals and groups recognize that in a democratic organization there are responsibilities as well as rights.

REFERENCES

APPLEBY, PAUL H., *Big Democracy,* Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., New York, 1945, chap. 8.

APPLEBY, PAUL H., *Policy and Administration,* University of Alabama Press, University, Alabama, 1949, chap. 4.

BENNE, KENNETH D., and MUNTYAN, BOZIDAR, *Human Relations in Curriculum Change,* The Dryden Press, New York, 1951.

BETHEL, LAWRENCE L., ALWATER, FRANKLIN S., SMITH, GEORGE H. E., and STUCKMAN, HARVEY A., JR., *Industrial Organization and Management,* 2d ed., McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., New York, 1950, chap. 31.

BROWN, ALVIN, *Organization of Industry,* Prentice-Hall, Inc., New York, 1947, chaps. 4, 7.

CLEETON, GLEN U., and MASON, CHARLES W., *Executive Ability, Its Discovery and Development,* The Antioch Press, Yellow Springs, Ohio, 1946, chaps. 12, 16.

DALE, ERNEST, *Planning and Developing the Company Organization Structure,* American Management Association, New York, 1952, chap. 6.

DAVIS, RALPH C., *The Fundamentals of Top Management,* Harper & Brothers, New York, 1951, chaps. 17, 18, 19.

DIMOCK, MARSHALL E., *The Executive in Action,* Harper & Brothers, New York, 1945, chaps. 8, 16.

FAYOL, HENRI, *General and Industrial Management,* Sir Isaac Pitman & Sons, Ltd., London, 1949, chap. 5.

GARDNER, BURLEIGH B., and MOORE, DAVID G., *Human Relations in Industry,* rev. ed., Richard D. Irwin, Inc., Chicago, 1950, chaps. 6, 7.

GORDON, ROBERT AARON, *Business Leadership in the Large Corporation,* The Brookings Institution, Washington, 1945, chap. 5.

GULICK, LUTHER, and URWICK, L. (editors), *Papers on the Science of Administration,* Institute of Public Administration, New York, 1937, chap. 1.

HILLMAN, ARTHUR, *Community Organization and Planning,* The Macmillan Company, New York, 1950, part III.

HYNEMAN, CHARLES S., *Bureaucracy in a Democracy,* Harper & Brothers, New York, 1950, chap. 21.

KIMBALL, DEXTER S., and KIMBALL, DEXTER S., JR., *Principles of Industrial Organization,* 5th ed., McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., New York, 1939, chap. 10.

LIVINGSTON, ROBERT T., *The Engineering of Organization and Management,* McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., New York, 1949, chaps. 3, 11.

MARX, FRITZ MORSTEIN (editor), *Elements of Public Administration,* Prentice-Hall, Inc., New York, 1946, chap. 7.

MILWARD, G. E., *An Approach to Management,* Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1947, part II.

MOONEY, JAMES D., *The Principles of Organization,* rev. ed., Harper & Brothers, New York, 1947, chap. 2.

NEWMAN, WILLIAM H., *Business Policies and Management,* 2d ed., South-Western Publishing Company, Cincinnati, 1947, chap. 20.

NEWMAN, WILLIAM H., *Administrative Action,* Prentice-Hall, Inc., New York, 1951, chap. 22.

PFIFFNER, JOHN M., *Public Administration,* rev. ed., The Ronald Press Company, New York, 1946, chaps. 9, 12.

ROETHLISBERGER, F. J., *Management and Morale,* Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1950, chap. 4.

SEARS, JESSE, *The Nature of the Administrative Process,* McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., New York, 1950, chap. 4.

SIMON, HERBERT A., *Administrative Behavior,* The Macmillan Company, New York, 1947, chap. 1.

TEAD, ORDWAY, *The Art of Administration,* McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., New York, 1951, chap. 12.

URWICK, L., *The Elements of Administration,* Harper & Brothers, New York, 1943, chaps. 4, 5.

WHITE, LEONARD, *Introduction to the Study of Public Administration,* 3d ed., The Macmillan Company, New York, 1948, chap. 15.

CHAPTER X

The Function of Problem Solving in Administration

How can an administrator of a small organization develop the means by which research on problems can take place?

What can an administrator do if the evidence before him dictates one policy direction and the members of the board are not inclined to accept the direction? How is the staff of an organization organized so as to aid a policy-making board to arrive at decisions?

What part do hunches, experience, and tradition have to play in the decision-making process?

How is a policy of public relations related to the problem-solving process? Should research evidence which appears to be detrimental to an organization be released to the public?

How can a problem-solving attitude be developed in an atmosphere that has been conditioned by bias and prejudice?

I

In all organizations decisions should be reached as expeditiously as possible. Under most circumstances the routine operation of an organization carries with it the bases upon which decisions are determined. However, important issues arise demanding solutions for which daily routine has not established precedence. When routine solutions fail, problems must be attacked from various directions. The process by which individuals sift alternatives, propose

solutions, collect data, and test conclusions is simply called *problem solving.* While the process is easily identifiable, the means by which it is accomplished require arduous thought and many administrators prefer the innocuous web of daily routine.

When administrators are confronted with the necessity of making a decision, they can dispose of it by resorting to prejudices, to opinions, to sheer guesses, to trial and error, or to imitation. Each of these methods of action is designed to relieve the administrator of the difficult duty of thinking and to substitute less demanding and more comfortable activities. The most effective decisions are achieved, however, when a situation serves to stimulate the problem-solving process. It is in this process that the highest form of thinking ability is employed, and it is in this process that discoveries, decisions, appraisals, acceptances, and rejections are made.

The essence of the problem-solving process is to be found in the conception of an idea translated into action research. The idea without research remains in the area of metaphysics, while research without the idea assumes the proportions of busywork. The administrator needs to bring constructive imagination to bear upon the problems of the organization. It is the administrator who must formulate the ideational framework so that the research can take place. He must transcend the littleness of fact gathering, not that the data-collecting aspect of research is insignificant or to be ignored. Research is the means by which an idea is brought to its fulfillment. It is the fact-finding process, the tedious, time-consuming, often disappointing process during which men using varied resources search for knowledge. The ability of the administrator to perceive the intrinsic value of research has as much impact upon an organization as the routine development and utilization of a research department.

Decision-making based upon a problem-solving approach consists of a number of individual but interrelated activities. While these activities appear as logical steps, building one upon the other, in the actual procedure, it is not always possible to clearly differen-

tiate the chronological order of the activities. Considered as the first phase of the process is the ability to recognize, formulate, identify, or describe the problem. Oftentimes, the difficulties inherent in this phase of the activity result in the substitution of problems for which solutions are more readily discernible. The second major phase involves a determination of the basic ideas contained in the problem—through the accumulation of data, the selection and evaluation of materials, and the formation of various approaches to action. Progress here may be erratic or it may take place systematically. In the final phase of the process the results of the preceding steps are put into operation. They may or may not effect a desirable solution to the problem, but the action that has taken place during the course of the entire activity has its beneficial aspects for all those who have participated.

All of the phases of problem solving, described above, may very well be taking place at the same time in an organization. Problems do not develop individually and through the course of thinking numerous by-products are apt to develop. These by-products in the form of new ideas, decisions, and problems demand additional action. It is evident that once initiated the problem-solving process is continuous, sustained constantly by new tasks.

Problem solving is not only within the province of the individual; it is a process that can be characteristic of group action. Groups in an organization can determine the nature of the problem, explore the means by which the problem can be solved, and attempt to put the conclusions of the process into operation. Often the group is in a better position to see all aspects of the problem than is the individual. In organizations it becomes necessary to establish opportunities for individual as well as group-centered problems. It needs to be recognized that individual problems affect the group and group problems affect all individuals. This is especially important in social institutions since the success with which a problem is handled is dependent upon the willingness of the group to accept the decisions.

While solutions to problems can often be found, this does not necessarily mean that they can be applied to a situation. It is possible to find administratively sound solutions to the problem of school district organization and yet, at times, an almost appalling social lag prevents placing the decision into practice. The problem-solving process does not relieve the administrator of his over-all responsibilities. It merely enables him to make decisions after the evidence is in and has been weighed. Problem solving is the scientific method for handling problems in a democratic society.

The problem-solving administrator is a realist who recognizes the limitations inherent in mankind, including himself. He recognizes that during the course of the existence of an organization many issues will arise that will not be solved by resorting to what has taken place in the past. He knows that his response sets can condition the formation of a problem, structure the means by which it is to be solved, and influence the decision. The administrator knows that through a systematic attack on problems and issues, the possibility exists that new and more complex problems will arise. These are things he knows and must accept or guard against. Above all, the administrator must have a fervent belief that thinking men, seeking the truth, and given the opportunity to seek the truth, will ultimately create a better organization and a better society.

II

Administrators frequently neglect the process by which a decision is reached although they are universally concerned with the manner in which the execution takes place. This is unfortunate since the means by which a decision is reached affects the individuals who must place into operation these decisions. Organizational approval, whether individually or collectively, of executive action is created to the extent that the personnel of the organization understand and accept decisions. It is for this reason that Simon declares: a theory of administration should be concerned with the processes of decision as well as with the processes of action."

Administration is ordinarily discussed as the art of "getting things done." Emphasis is placed upon processes and methods for insuring incisive action. Principles are set forth for securing concerted action from groups of men. In all this discussion, however, not very much attention is paid to the choice which prefaces all action—to the determining of what is to be done rather than to the actual doing.

Although any practical activity involves both "deciding" and "doing," it has not commonly been recognized that a theory of administration should be concerned with the processes of decision as well as with the processes of action.[1]

Not only must the decision-making process be considered as an important element in a theory of administration, as described by Simon, it must also be considered the focal point of successful management. As organizations increase in their complexity, the executive is faced with many problems that demand decisions. Balderston describes the importance of the decision-making process to business management and also identifies a need for systematic consideration of the voluminous data available to chief executives.

The making of decisions is the focal point of management. Some decisions are routine in that they are guided by company tradition and practice, or by policies established in the past. Other decisions give deep concern to their originators because of their fundamental significance to the future of the business. To such decisions an executive needs to bring common sense, judgment born of experience, all of his knowledge concerning the outside forces that play upon his enterprise, and the fundamental nature of the enterprise itself. But for most companies the factual information is boundless—so voluminous that some device is needed to bring diverse data into sharp focus in one comprehensive and graphic picture.[2]

It needs to be recognized that policy-making decisions are generally arrived at by a board of control or a legislative body rather

[1] Herbert A. Simon, *Administrative Behavior*, The Macmillan Company, New York, 1947, p. 1.

[2] C. C. Balderston and Others, *Management of An Enterprise*, Prentice-Hall, Inc., New York, 1949, p. 28.

than by an administrator. The administrator's role is to collect sufficient data to enable the decision-making process to operate efficiently. While the establishment of policy by a board appears to limit the decision-making powers of the administrator, it needs to be recognized that in administering policy the necessity for arriving at decisions is unending. Marx stresses the need for data collecting in governmental administration so that decisions amicable to the general welfare can be made.

The broad spread of governmental activities in the service state has had consequences extending beyond the mere expansion of public services. When government is interposed at many points in our society, it gains extraordinary opportunities for developing a system of intelligence whose output becomes public knowledge. Take something as vital as dependable statistics on unemployment. Before the more than 400,000 Smiths, together with the Joneses, the Thompsons, and the rest of us, had been duly entered in the central records of the Social Security Board, we had to guess at the volume of unemployment. Now, as an incidental by-product of our social security scheme, we can always know, with a high degree of exactness. Fortified with up-to-date information, government is in a position to plan policy with considerable assurance. It is also able to obtain early warning of impending slumps and take remedial action before being overtaken by events. It can even put its finger on specific areas where maladjustments have become acute, and probe into underlying causes.

The intelligence function of modern government is in many ways crucial to the fate of the economic and social order. Jeremy Bentham saw it in this light more than a century ago. It lies at the heart of our attempts at achieving a high level of employment in the postwar period. The role of the federal government in attaining maximum employment is predicated on the availability of a large array of detailed statistical data on such activities as consumer spending; business expenditures and outlays—including construction, additions to inventories, and exports; and state and local expenditures—including projected public works. Moreover, retrospective data alone would not be adequate. They must be supplemented by data which predict future facts. We would be stopped in our tracks and left to face complete un-

certainty if the entire body of government intelligence were still in the state which existed only fifteen years ago. Today we are better prepared, because government, in its interlocking with the enterprise economy, has multiplied its eyes and added finer lenses.

The more it knows, the better government can judge. Seeing more, it is no longer so easily eluded by those whose doings shy from light, nor is it quickly misled and confused by the assertions of optimists and pessimists alike. Capitalizing on its far-flung intelligence, government can substantiate its hunches and projections, and is less helpless in rebuttal. In our civilization, research and analysis of information, together with scientific fact-gathering and wider dissemination of knowledge, are national resources of the greatest practical value because they give our hand a surer touch in shaping our institutional and technological environment. Truth is an objectifying influence in the identification of the public interest and the pursuit of public ends. It takes the wind out of the sails of partisan clamor and intentional or unintentional misrepresentation.

The acquisition of knowledge is a field of primary concern to democratic government. Its ascendancy was properly stressed in the epochmaking report of Great Britain's Machinery of Government Committee under Haldane's chairmanship at the end of World War I. Our experience in World War II with the Office of Scientific Research and Development, established for the purpose of securing adequate provision for research on scientific and medical problems relating to national defense, represents a memorable step in the same direction. But research must not be confined to laboratories alone. The whole business establishment of government, although it is in business for business' sake, is at the same time a gigantic test tube with which we gradually expand our social knowledge. In this way we not only augment the body of information to guide the policymaking authorities; we also set down increasingly definite terms of reference for legitimate public discussion. It is harder to fool the people when authentic facts and figures make lies and wild statements uncomfortable for their authors.

Through its administrative system, government has been able to recognize its intelligence function. Without something like the administrative machinery which we have built up over the years, government intelligence would necessarily be secondhand and thus of dubious

merit. The risk of accepting at its face value the brief of an interest group or the complaint of a constituent is well known to every seasoned lawmaker. With literally hundreds of thousands of government employees in daily touch with countless economic and social activities and various elements of the population, headquarters offices meet few obstacles in providing for continuing public reconnaissance, in gauging pressures and tensions in the industrial order, and in getting at the relevant facts. On the other hand, general awareness by the public of the intelligence function of government has a restraining effect on the voraciousness of special interests and the character of pressure-group rationalizations. To this extent, administration places itself deliberately between contending forces, each of which could have its way only at the expense of all of us.[3]

Since school systems are governmental agencies, it is necessary to understand the relationship which exists between the administrative hierarchy and the board of education. School systems are legal entities which have been established by the State to promote the educational growth of the young people of society. This pattern is unique since the national government does not have the responsibility for the system of education found in the forty-eight states. The responsibility for public education has been assumed by each of the states, and, in turn, each of the states has established its own system. While this developmental pattern has created many unique situations, there are certain basic practices which have evolved and which today are considered as basic principles of school board control over public education. According to Moehlman there are seven areas of responsibility for school boards.

(1) Develop policies according to the law and the education needs of the people; (2) interpret and harmonize the needs of the community and the requirements of the professional organization; (3) select the executive personnel; (4) approve means by which professional agents and agencies may make these policies effective; (5) furnish financial means according to the laws which provide the physical and

[3] Fritz Morstein Marx (editor), *Elements of Public Administration,* Prentice-Hall, Inc., New York, 1946, pp. 114–116.

education conditions by which organized activity may be carried on; (6) appraise the value of the agents and of the services rendered to the community; and (7) keep the people intelligently informed of the purpose, value, conditions, and needs of public education within the community.[4]

To carry out its responsibilities the school board needs professional assistance, and the chief officer of the administrative hierarchy assumes the role of the board's executive officer. In this role the executive officer is in a position to assist the board in its planning operations, to provide it with information which can be used as a basis for planning, and to help it make effective decisions. The functional role of the superintendent in assisting the board to reach decisions has been studied by a committee of the American Association of School Administrators.

After the board has participated in democratic planning and has become well informed, it must act. It must approve the appointment of personnel, determine the location of school buildings, adopt budgets, approve courses of study, set up policies, and be the final arbiter on many controversial issues. Some decisions will be made by the board on the basis of clear-cut professional recommendations of the superintendent of schools. Some decisions will be delegated to the superintendent within the framework of the schoolboard policy. At all times it is the duty of the superintendent to advise the board and to help insure that the wording and enforcement of its policies will reflect credit on the schoolboard and promote the best interests of the school program.

The agenda for board meetings should be well organized, so as to expedite the board's work and also to provide the basis for intelligent action. Possible actions by the board should be presented in writing for board consideration. The supporting statements should anticipate the board's questions as to the related circumstances and may present possible alternatives. The superintendent should be so well grounded in school law that every proposal put before the board for action conforms with the controlling statutes. As a general rule, all meetings and

[4] Arthur B. Moehlman, *School Administration,* 2d ed., Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston, 1951, p. 135.

discussions of the board should be open to the public, with the exception of the times when personnel problems and legal strategy must be considered.[5]

It should be readily apparent that the administrator is responsible for assisting in the decision-making process as well as for making decisions.

Research, the seeking of knowledge, is the means by which the administrator seeks to implement the decision-making process. The research activity is designed to provide data so that decisions can be reached. The research itself does not provide the answer to a problem, it may suggest a decision or alternative decisions. Executives need to recognize that research is not a substitute for creative thinking about the problems of administration, it is only a process by which the individual should be assisted to make more adequate decisions. There is a romance about research that need not be dispelled if the executive can use the process effectively. McConnell, Scates, and Freeman have succeeded admirably in describing the hope inherent in a conceptual framework which includes research while still recognizing the limitations of the research process.

Someone may be prompted to inquire: "In emphasizing the subjective side of research, has the writer lost sight of the importance of facts? Would he say, as in the case of instruments, that facts are of great importance but are, nevertheless, subsidiary to the framework of thought which incorporates them?" To this I must reply unequivocally in the affirmative. I believe that facts are not so important in the progress of science as are the concepts which fit these facts together in a certain order. I do not mean by this to undervalue the several centuries of so-called "objective science." I mean rather that I regard objective science as only in a small degree objective and in very large degree subjective. It is objective in that it is verifiable, within assignable limits of probability, but it is subjective in that the facts observed are immediately interpreted in terms of some pattern which enables man to make sense out of them.

[5] *The American School Superintendency,* Thirtieth Yearbook, American Association of School Administrators, Washington, D.C., 1952, p. 125.

We may well note that Ptolemy and Copernicus both had substantially the same objective facts with which to start; yet their theories were totally different. In the field of medicine, Pasteur met with failure after failure in his search for successful vaccines. The objective facts indicated that his ideas were wrong. Yet he kept on, in spite of facts, until he had made many of his ideas work out. Galton endured years of discouraging experiences; the answers to his questions were negative until he had refined his concepts sufficiently. These workers had compelling concepts transcending the order of the facts with which they were working. We find somewhat the converse in the three-century-old question concerning the nature of light, which cannot, apparently, be settled by objective facts of the sort thus far observed. Physicists have repeatedly proved that light is a matter of waves (in some presumed medium), and other physicists, with different notions, have proved equally well and on as many occasions that light is a matter of corpuscles, or pellets. The facts to date are not so important in answering the question as would be some integrating concept which would embrace all of them and be able to withstand attacks of the future.

We know that science must have facts. Without facts we have merely speculative philosophy. Facts play a vital (even if limited) role in the development of science. The principal limitation is that the factuality of facts may be very low and the perceptual metamorphosis of facts may be very great. One does not sense facts in a mental vacuum but in an ordered and active mind. The facts are set against a cultivated and purposeful mental background; and, as these backgrounds differ from person to person, so the facts themselves will be perceived in varying ways and will mean different things. Practically, a fact is not an objective thing; when observed, it becomes an item in a scheme of thought. What the significance of the fact is will depend largely on the thought-pattern in which it is caught. Thus a fact has as many facets as there are trains of thought which may embody it. And each thought-pattern that persists in the mind of an observer will normally block other possible patterns, so that the observer notes only that facet of the fact which suits his purpose, and he becomes insensitive to the many other phrases of significance which the fact may have. Facts are but one element in the perceptual process; the active concepts of the observer furnish other elements. We should put our trust, not in facts

as such, but rather in the interaction of many minds observing similar facts, projecting these facts against different conceptual backgrounds, testing the divergent interpretations by means of further observation, and seeking explanations of any final differences.

Thus research is seen not to be a simple matter of gathering facts. In abstracting facts from their setting, research mutilates nature severely. It looks only at selected aspects of phenomena which suit its immediate purpose. The researcher then integrates these selected aspects of normal situations into some form of order. I think "research" can best be defined as the process of removing facts from their natural setting and fitting them together again according to some mental pattern. Insofar as this mental pattern approaches the form of relationship existing in the external world, the research will be profitable. Insofar as the mental pattern is crude and inaccurate, the research will advance understanding and insights but little. A graduate student of mine wrote, "research begins with facts and ends with facts." This is a common notion. I think a more accurate description is, *Research begins with an idea and ends with an idea.* The initial idea is the formulation of the problem for study; the subsequent idea is the thought-pattern which emerges as a result of the study.

My concept of research will be displeasing to those who seek certainty and have turned to science in the hope of finding the absolute. To such, a belief in the dominant role of the human intellect in prosecuting research will prove as unwelcome as Copernicus' theory of the universe was to the medieval mind. To make the progress of science contingent upon constructive imagination is to remove it from the pinnacle of complete validity and place it in the realm of the hazardous. Yet, from reading the history of research, I can frame no other picture. Research is not always right. Science is not necessarily permanent in its details. The physical sciences have undergone revolutionary changes in fundamental concepts within the span of our own lifetime.

Research does not furnish the absolute. Research is a faith. It makes no claim to infallibility; it should make little claim to immediate correctness. But it represents a faith in a method of answering questions —a faith that this method will, in the long run, produce better answers than will other processes that mankind has tried. Its state at any given time is a certain degree of approximation to objective truth; it

hopes through continued studies and through challenges—through the long-time interaction of observation and critical interpretation—to refine the accuracy of that approximation until it is closer to nature than any demands, practical or theoretical, may require. The findings of any single study, therefore, represent a stage of understanding—a stage through which our knowledge passes on its way from relative ignorance to relative comprehension.

The objective world lies before man in cold, meaningless materiality. Man, with his vision ever on a more abundant life, seeks to read meaning into this external world. Through his powers of perception and integration, he strives to appropriate aspects of phenomena which he can utilize in building mental constructs that will aid him in comprehending the world. In this growing comprehension he finds both satisfaction and increasing power. Many of his questions have already been answered; and he has a belief that what he does not now know, his children and his children's children, through research, will come closer to knowing.[6]

Decisions in an organization are made by humans for other humans, whether on the basis of whim or research. The readiness of an individual to accept a decision is dependent upon the individual's perception of the decision. If the individual participates in the decision-making process, then the chances for improved perception and acceptance are enhanced. The value of group participation in the decision-making process can be justified on the theoretical concept of democracy or the successful experience of business corporations. It has become increasingly clear in recent years that imposed decisions create serious maladjustments for organizations. Efforts to improve officer-enlisted men relationships in the military services, union-management relationships in industry, and community-school relationships in society have demonstrated that cooperative decision-making can function effectively. Tannenbaum and Massarik have analyzed the many advantages of cooperative decision-

[6] T. R. McConnell, Douglas E. Scates, and Frank N. Freeman, *The Conceptual Structure of Educational Research,* Supplemental Educational Monographs, No. 55, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1942, pp. 33–36.

making and also have defined the conditions under which such action is most beneficial.

Decisions are made by managers in order to organize, direct, or control responsible subordinates to the end that all service contributions be coordinated in the attainment of an enterprise purpose. Since managers are those who accomplish results through subordinates, the latter are always directly and intimately affected by managerial decisions and therefore may have a considerable interest in them. Because of this possible interest, subordinates may have a strong desire, particularly in a nation with deeply-ingrained democratic traditions to participate in the determination of matters affecting them. It is of importance, therefore, to consider the form which such participation might assume.

Decision-making involves a conscious choice or selection of one behaviour alternative from among a group of two or more behaviour alternatives. Three steps are involved in the decision-making process. First, an individual must become aware of as many as possible of those behaviour alternatives which are relevant to the decision to be made. Secondly, he must define each of these alternatives, a definition which involves a determination of as many as possible of the consequences related to each alternative under consideration. Thirdly, the individual must exercise a choice between the alternatives, that is, make a decision.

In enterprises, managerial subordinates, as subordinates, can participate in the first two steps of the managerial decision-making process. They cannot participate in the third step. The actual choice between relevant alternatives must be made or accepted by the manager who is responsible to his superior for the decision. However, subordinates can provide and discuss with their manager information with respect both to relevant alternatives and to the consequences attendant upon specific alternatives. In so doing they are participating in the managerial decision-making process.

The participation with which we are here concerned may take place in two different ways. First, it may involve interaction solely between a subordinate and his manager. This would be the case where a worker originates a suggestion which he transmits to his boss. Secondly, it may involve interaction between a group of subordinates and their man-

ager. This would be the case where a manager calls his subordinates together to discuss a common problem or to formulate a recommendation.

It becomes useful to inquire why managers might find it advantageous to use this device. In other words, what are the possible benefits which might accrue to an enterprise whose managers made it possible for subordinates to participate in the decision-making process? In providing an answer to this question, it is first necessary to indicate the criterion which would guide the managerial choice relating to the use of participation.

A manager of an enterprise (profit or nonprofit) who behaves rationally will attempt to make a selection from among alternatives related to any problem which will maximize results (the degree of attainment of a given end) at a given cost or which will attain given results at the lowest cost. This is the criterion of rationality. Guided by this criterion, rational managers will find it advantageous to use participation whenever such use will lead to increased results at a given cost or to the attainment of given results at a lower cost.

There are many advantages which *may* stem from the use of participation as a managerial device. The following are the principal ones:

1. A higher rate of output and increased quality of product (including reduced spoilage and wastage) as a result of greater personal effort and attention on the part of subordinates.

2. A reduction in turnover, absenteeism, and tardiness.

3. A reduction in the number of grievances and more peaceful manager-subordinate and manager-union relations.

4. A greater readiness to accept change. When changes are arbitrarily introduced from above without explanation, subordinates tend to feel insecure and to take countermeasures aimed at a sabotage of the innovations. But when they have participated in the process leading to the decision, they have had an opportunity to be heard. They know what to expect and why, and they may desire the change. Blind resistance tends to become intelligent adaptation as insecurity is replaced by security.

5. Greater ease in the management of subordinates. Fewer managers may be necessary, the need for close supervision may be reduced, and less disciplinary action may be called for. Subordinates who have par-

ticipated in the process leading toward a determination of matters directly affecting them may have a greater sense of responsibility with respect to the performance of their assigned tasks and may be more willing to accept the authority of their superiors. All managers possess a given amount of formal authority delegated to them by their superiors. But formal authority is not necessarily the equivalent of effective authority. The real source of the authority possessed by an individual lies in the acceptance of its exercise by those who are subject to it. It is the subordinates of an individual who determine the authority which he may wield. Formal authority is, in effect, nominal authority. It becomes real only when it is accepted. Thus, to be effective, formal authority must coincide with authority determined by its acceptance. The latter defines the useful limits of the former. The use of participation as a managerial device may result in a widening of these limits, reducing the amount of resistance to the exercise of formal authority and increasing the positive responses of subordinates to managerial directives.

6. The improved quality of managerial decisions. It is seldom if ever possible for managers to have knowledge of *all* alternatives and *all* consequences related to the decisions which they must make. Because of the existence of barriers to the upward flow of information in most enterprises, much valuable information possessed by subordinates never reaches their managers. Participation tends to break down the barriers, making the information available to managers. To the extent that such information alters the decisions which managers make, the quality of their decisions may thereby be improved.[7]

The importance of problem-centered groups for the psychological welfare of individuals in a democratic society is considered by deHuszar.

The significance of the problem-centered-group is manifold. It creates integration by encouraging participation, which has important psychological consequences for the participating individuals.

[7] Robert Tannenbaum and Fred Massarik, "Participation by Subordinates in the Managerial Decision-making Process," *Canadian Journal of Economic and Political Science,* August, 1950, pp. 416–418; as quoted in Robert Dubin, *Human Relations in Administration,* Prentice-Hall, Inc., New York, 1951, pp. 223–228.

Vital attachments are created only in the intimacy of close association, where everyone can take part and have his say. The problem-centered-group generates new dynamics, inspiring confidence, encouraging self-respect, and building morale. Persons who are discouraged alone find ways of working together for mutual benefit. Useful activity, helping others as well as oneself, puts a spring in the step, a glint in the eye.

When people work together, helping each other, they grow rapidly in their willingness and power to accept responsibility. In fact, the word "responsibility" is not a word that implies lone living, rugged individualism, or self-centered thinking. Its root is the word "response," implying mutuality, interrelationships. It suggests not a lone individual but an individual conscious of, and responding to, the needs of the situation. Our craving for togetherness and belongingness is an evidence of our instinctive recognition of the fact that the fullness of individualism depends on the fullness of relationships with others. *Too many self-centered individuals create disintegration. Whatever brings individuals together creates integration.*

The problem-centered-group opens the way to action—do-democracy—by providing a method of meeting problems. To repeat, as things stand today, we have too many words unrelated to action. The transition from talk-democracy to do-democracy can be achieved by the use of problem-centered-groups. Opportunities for do-democracy abound: children and parents participating in education, workers in industry, citizens in government and so forth. Through such participation we evolve better educational institutions, more satisfying relations in industry, and more efficient government.

By uniting individuals in active groups we will stimulate them to work productively on many practical problems of importance to all individuals, real problems arising from real needs. Naturally, these problem-centered-groups are nowhere as clear-cut, symmetrical, and uniform as they appear on the charts. Like all human relationships, they cannot remain static. Some are so short-lived that they last only for a few minutes, some last for years. Individuals shift from one to another as problems change, participating in a number of problem-centered-groups through the course of a single day.[8]

[8] George B. deHuszar, *Practical Applications of Democracy,* Harper & Brothers, New York, 1945, pp. 31–33.

Problem solving is a process that starts with a problem and ends with a decision. In the interval between problem and decision the process of research is active. Once the research process has brought into being an analysis of the original problem, it becomes essential that some decision be made. The decision may be to take a new course of action, to maintain the status quo, or to pursue some additional research. An organization cannot remain stagnant and survive, and decisions must be made to convert study and planning into action. The problem-solving process is completed to the extent that the consequences of the research are tested and evaluated. The importance of using this process for an action program is stressed by Balderston.

Decision making is at the very heart of operating through an organization. "To decide" is the briefest possible description of an executive's duties. The decision is the point at which action starts. How decisions are made and communicated is therefore of fundamental importance.

The preparatory work incident to the rendering of a decision may be done by someone other than the executive who "makes" it. The idea from which the decision stems may have come from a subordinate several echelons below him, or from a fellow executive on the same level, or one on a level above him. The development of the idea may require a long period of patient analysis and investigation that takes form in a written report setting forth the pros and cons and the supporting evidence. Or the development may be as brief as a suggestion made orally, with little or no explanation. In short, the decision itself may be the culmination either of exhaustive study or of "snap judgment."

The decision converts study and planning into action. It is a manifestation of authority and automatically involves the assumption of responsibility for the outcome. In that moment of time when an executive decides "yes" or "no" he commits himself and the forces at his disposal. If proven correct by subsequent events, his decision adds luster to his reputation; if proven wrong, both his reputation and his company may suffer. The challenge of an executive position is that it involves an unending stream of decisions, many of which must be made in the absence of all the facts that would be desirable. Since delay may

stop the efforts of many colleagues, the decision must often be made on the basis of judgment alone or on a combination of facts and judgment. When time is of the essence, the willingness to act, even at some risk, is an essential to executive success.

Once the decision is made, the maker issues orders to carry it out. These orders may be oral or written and signed by the responsible executive. Obviously, whatever communication passes between the superior and the subordinate reveals to the subordinate the caliber of the superior's mind. Such discussion should give the subordinate a clear idea of what is required. Consequently, the order should be sufficiently specific, so that the subordinate receives any information that was available to the superior officer but not to him. On the other hand, if the order is overly specific and detailed, the subordinate may feel restrained from using his initiative. Provided the subordinate has had experience and training, the order should indicate what is to be done, but the choice of methods should be left to him. Moreover, an order should never be issued if an executive does not have the necessary authority, or if it is evident that circumstances will prevent the order from being carried out.

Whether an order is given orally or in writing, whether it is a specific order for a given task or a standing order of general import, the essential characteristics of a well-conceived order are clarity and completeness. Clarity is the product of logical thinking on the part of the issuing executive, and if he has thought carefully, the orders are likely to be brief. Moreover, the language used and the manner in which the instructions are given have much to do with the attitude with which the recipient begins his task. Furthermore, if orders are issued so frequently that neither the issuers nor the receivers are likely to remember precisely what is said, written orders are advisable. Such orders not only prevent misunderstandings at the time of transmittal, but protect both parties in case of later controversy.[9]

III

Scientific management means a constant search for the facts, the true actualities, and their unprejudiced analysis. It means that the

[9] C. C. Balderston and Others, *Management of An Enterprise,* Prentice-Hall, Inc., New York, 1949, pp. 472–474.

school executive develops a problem-solving attitude as contrasted with a let-well-enough-alone mind set. It means that decisions are reached upon the basis of carefully analyzed evidence and not tradition or whim. It means that recognition is given to the impact of decisions upon individuals and groups, as well as the influence of individuals and groups upon decisions. Scientific management means promoting the cooperative integration of the human and physical resources within an organization in an effort to maximize organizational efficiency.

School executives need to live the role of scientific managers if they are to survive the challenge of twentieth century complexity. School problems are no longer family matters to be solved by reliance upon limited personal experience. Decisions with reference to increased budgets, school building programs, changing curriculum patterns, and increased student enrollments affect thousands of individuals and involve complex social and economic issues. The decisions which must be made can best be made when the school executive applies a process which has been described in this chapter as problem solving.

The problem-solving process is not alone a series of carefully defined actions, it is a state of mind. Fundamentally, it is a belief by the executive that it is possible for individuals in a democratic society to continually improve. In such a society there exist these basic ideals:

The first declares the *dignity and worth of the individual.* Man is placed first; things are subjugated to the welfare of man. Merit, real or potential, is ascribed to every individual. Because every person has merit, each person becomes responsible for the development of all other persons. The best society is composed of individuals who achieve their best, their fullest potential. The differences among individuals make each, at his best, desirably different in many respects from other individuals.

The second ideal of democracy places *reliance upon the method of intelligence.* This ideal conceives that man's problems can be solved

through his own intellectual efforts. It does not seek to minimize the importance of emotional drives and habits in man's life; it does emphasize the importance of intelligent utilization of his drives and habits. It is diametrically opposed to the concept that man's problems may be solved by appeals to authority.

The third ideal of democracy places *reliance on the cooperative use of intelligence in the solution of problems common to the group.* This ideal introduces the element of cooperative action. Cooperative action is action which will bring the individual intelligence of each member of the group to bear most fully and appropriately in the solution of a common problem. The recognition of the dignity and worth of each member of the group provides a basis for cooperative action. "Come let us reason together" is the watchword of this ideal.[10]

Given this conceptual frame of reference it is then possible to establish a relationship between scientific management, problem solving, and democratic administration.

There exist many delineations of the concept of problem solving, but fundamentally they agree that the individual defines a problem, hypothesizes actions that may help him cope with it, engages in actions designed to assist him to reach decisions, studies the consequences, and generalizes from them. Whitney has said that a high degree of identity exists among the concepts of reflection, science, and research. His analysis of these concepts would seem to indicate that the school executive engaged in studied deliberations of school issues is indeed engaged in the process of problem solving.

The thought process is careful, ordered reflection. It arises out of a feeling of doubt and a need for certainty, from which a definite problem emerges. The most likely solution is examined in terms of all evidence available, obtained from all possible sources and by methods pertinent to the conditions of the problem situation. Finally, the best

[10] *Educational Leaders—Their Function and Preparation,* A Report of the Second Work Conference of the National Conference of Professors of Educational Administration, Madison, Wisconsin, August 29–September 4, 1948, pp. 5–6.

conclusion is tentatively accepted but is kept under continuous critical examination for open-minded evaluation of its prognostic value.

When the attitude and methods of reputable science are examined, an identical procedure from felt need to prediction is discovered. Scientific thinking is in terms of carefully organized reflection. Likewise, the methods of the best research are found to be scientific in terms of accepted mind processes, involving all essential steps in problem solving, through critical examination of hypotheses to final tentative corroboration of generalizations and succeeding search for certainty as a basis for action.

In fact, the careful thinker, whether in shop, office, or study, proceeds in terms of delayed action after a period of reflection, when evidence on solutions can be carefully weighed. This is the method of creditable research, in whatever field it is carried on.[11]

To engage in problem solving is to be engaged in research. Unfortunately, the term "research" often brings with it a connotation of test tubes, scientists with long beards, and unintelligible mathematical symbols. As a result, the school executive is prone to delegate to researchers basic studies, the results of which could be significant for educational improvement. This delegation has resulted in an amazing accumulation of research findings but only meager program changes. Corey has proposed that better decisions and practices would result if practitioners (administrators, supervisors, and teachers) would attempt to study their problems scientifically in order to guide, correct, and evaluate their decisions and actions. He advances the concept of action research as a means by which the individual working cooperatively can actively engage in the process of social research.

Action research in education is research undertaken by practitioners in order that they may improve their practices. The people who actually teach children, supervise teachers, or administer school systems attempt to solve their practical problems by using the methods of

[11] Frederick L. Whitney, *The Elements of Research,* 3d ed., Prentice-Hall, Inc., New York, 1950, pp. 27–28.

science. They accumulate evidence to define their problems more sharply. They draw on all of the experience available to them for action hypotheses that give promise of enabling them to ameliorate or eliminate the difficulties of their day-to-day work. They test out these promising procedures on the job and accumulate evidence of their effectiveness. They try to generalize as carefully as possible in order that their research may contribute to the solution of future problems or to the elimination of future difficulties.

One of the psychological values of action research is that the people who must, by the very nature of their professional responsibilities, improve their practices are the ones who engage in the research to learn what represents improvement. They themselves try out new and seemingly more promising ways of teaching or supervision or administering, and they study the consequences.

There are two alternatives to action research as a method of improving educational practices. One, a procedure that most people resort to as they try to do their jobs more adequately, is to make changes on the basis of subjective impressions of what the problems are. Then with a minimum of emphasis on testing or the accumulation of objective evidence, judgments are formed about the consequences of the attempted improvements.

The second alternative is to ask the professional educational investigator to study the problems and suggest solutions. This alternative has two basic limitations. In the first place, the professional investigator can never study individual problems in any strict sense. They are peculiar to the particular situation and people involved. A second limitation is that even when the recommendations are sound, it is difficult to incorporate them into the behavior patterns of practitioners. It is relatively easy to talk a better kind of teaching or supervision or administering as a consequence of reading or hearing what others say should be done. But there is a great difference between this modification in vocabulary and any substantial modification in behavior. An indispensable part of action research is actual practice of more promising procedures.

Probably the major difference between action research and traditional educational research arises from the motivation of the investigators. In fundamental research the basic aim is to conduct an inquiry

that will result in generalizations of broad applicability. The traditional educational researcher is motivated by his desire to arrive at "the truth." If he is cautious, he will report findings as "true" only within certain limits of probability. But to the degree that the investigation results in generalizations of the widest possible applicability, it is considered to be excellent research.

Those who engage in action research do so primarily because they wish to improve their own practices. Action research is conducted in the heat of combat, so to speak. It is conducted by teacher or supervisors or administrators in order that they may know, on the basis of relatively objective evidence, whether or not they are accomplishing the things they hope to accomplish.

The differences in methodology between traditional research and action research are minor. Each investigator attempts to define the problem being studied with precision, to derive his hypotheses from as rich a background of information related to the problem as possible, to design an inquiry so that it will result in a genuine test of the hypotheses, to use facts or evidence rather than subjective impressions throughout the research procedure, and to generalize cautiously and tentatively from the evidence collected. The conditions under which the two investigators carry out their inquiries, however, may differ appreciably. The traditional investigator in education tries to control a situation so that many of the variables involved in real teaching or supervising or administering are ruled out by definition or by the use of laboratory techniques. This practice results in a more definitive test of stated hypotheses. But precision is gained at the expense of the relevance of the findings. People engaged in action research conduct their inquiries in the complicated psycho-sociological climate of on-going school activities. Because of the multiplicity of variables involved, the research is often lacking in precision. The results, however, have meaning for practice because they derive from an inquiry carried out in a real situation.

A dominant theme in the argument has been that research quality must be viewed in relative terms. It is possible to progress gradually from the casual method ordinarily used to cope with practical difficulties to a method much more scrupulously scientific. As im-

provements are made in the methodology of action research, increased confidence in the inferences and generalizations drawn from the research data becomes possible.

Improvements in method can characterize any element of the total process of research. To expect to leap all at once from the everyday method of common sense to a method that incorporates the best scientific procedures is unrealistic. But to improve gradually requires little more than a commitment to the method of science and a willingness to take the chances that are always involved in experimentation. A commitment to the method of science is more likely to result from the persuasion of events than from the persuasion of other men. Relatively dependable consequences are available only when the scientific method is used. It is this dependability of results that argues most strongly for the scientific method of problem solving—for action research. The best way of learning how to conduct action research and of discovering the values it possesses is to try it.

Action research in the field of education need not involve the cooperative activities of a number of people, but in most instances cooperation is highly desirable. Many of the improvements that should be made in teaching, supervising, or administering cannot be effected if only one person changes his behavior. Little can be done about most important educational difficulties unless a number of people modify their ideas and practices. Therefore, as many as possible of the people who will be affected by attempts to improve a difficult situation should be involved in those attempts. The cooperative efforts of all these people will tend to result in better problem definition, more realistic consideration of action hypotheses, easier translation of these hypotheses into action, and better interpretation of the evidence accumulated, than the efforts of any one of them alone.

Making action research cooperative introduces all the complications involved in group work. If cooperative action research is to be most effective, members of working groups must feel free to introduce modifications in the procedures. Their ways of working must be appropriate to the job they are working on, and they must have numerous opportunities to try out and evaluate processes that give promise of increasing productivity.

If the quality of the methods now being employed by teachers, supervisors, and administrators in attacking their problems is to improve, there must be considerable change in the working environment and atmosphere of most school systems. Whether or not these changes will be effected, whether or not conditions favorable to action research will be established, depends largely on the status leaders. They must take the initiative in making it possible for teachers to admit and discuss their professional limitations, to hypothesize creatively, to have the resources and consultative help they need, to obtain the best possible evidence of the consequences of changes, and to derive from this evidence generalizations that are sound and helpful guides to future behavior.[12]

Problem solving, decision-making, and research are all aspects of a process by which the executive seeks to improve the operational aspects of the organization. It is now possible to identify the facets of this action.

1. The process is stimulated by the necessity for the executive to make decisions. These decisions may be made necessary by daily operational matters or by the consideration of long-range plans. Anticipation of issues by the executive will involve immediate decisions to seek data so that future decisions can be made more intelligently.
2. To make good decisions the executive needs to develop an attitudinal set which has been characterized as problem solving. It should be recognized that many decisions can be made without recourse to research findings; that professional knowledge and experience, organizational routine, and established policies have determined the course which many decisions must take.
3. Problem solving in administration involves defining the problem, hypothesizing, developing a design to test the hy-

[12] Stephen M. Corey, *Action Research to Improve School Practices,* Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, 1953, pp. 141–145.

potheses, getting evidence, and generalizing from this evidence. This process can be carried on by the individual, but it should be a cooperative activity if it affects the members of the organization.

4. The problem-solving process is used to enable the executive to reach decisions and these decisions should be made.
5. Once the decision has been made it needs to be transmitted into organizational action, and this action is then subject to evaluation.

REFERENCES

BALDERSTON, C. CANBY, BRECHT, ROBERT P., KARABASZ, VICTOR S., and RIDDLE, ROBERT J., *Management of an Enterprise,* 2d ed., Prentice-Hall, Inc., New York, 1941, chaps. 3, 27, 28.

BARNARD, CHESTER I., *The Functions of the Executive,* Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1948, chap. 13.

BERRIEN, F. K., *Comments and Cases on Human Relations,* Harper & Brothers, New York, 1951, chap. 3.

BOGARDUS, EMORY S., *Sociology,* 3d ed., The Macmillan Company, New York, 1949, chap. 16.

DALE, ERNEST, *Planning and Developing the Company Organization Structure,* American Management Association, New York, 1952, chaps. 6, 7.

DAVIS, RALPH C., *The Fundamentals of Top Management,* Harper & Brothers, New York, 1951, chap. 3.

DEHUSZAR, GEORGE B., *Practical Applications of Democracy,* Harper & Brothers, New York, 1945, chaps. 1, 2, 3, 10.

DIMOCK, MARSHALL E., *The Executive in Action,* Harper & Brothers, New York, 1945, chap. 10.

DUBIN, ROBERT, *Human Relations in Administration,* Prentice-Hall, Inc., New York, 1951, chap. 13.

GORDON, ROBERT AARON, *Business Leadership in the Large Corporation,* The Brookings Institution, Washington, 1945, chaps. 4, 5.

HEMPEL, EDWARD H. (editor), *Small Plant Management,* McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., New York, 1950, chap. 14.

HERTZ, DAVID BENDEL, *The Theory and Practice of Industrial Re-*

search, McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., New York, 1950, chaps. 1, 2, 3, 4, 8.

HYNEMAN, CHARLES S., *Bureaucracy in a Democracy,* Harper & Brothers, New York, 1950, chap. 21.

KILLEFFER, D. H., *The Genius of Industrial Research,* Reinhold Publishing Company, New York, 1948, chaps. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 9.

KIMBALL, DEXTER S., and KIMBALL, DEXTER S., JR., *Principles of Industrial Organization,* 5th ed., McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., New York, 1939, chap. 22.

LEPAWSKY, ALBERT, *Administration,* Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., New York, 1949, chap. 17.

LESTER, RICHARD A., *Labor and Industrial Relations,* The Macmillan Company, New York, 1951, chap. 1.

LEWIN, KURT, *Resolving Social Conflicts,* Gertrud W. Lewin (editor), Harper & Brothers, New York, 1948, chaps. 8, 13.

LIVINGSTON, ROBERT T., *The Engineering of Organization and Management,* McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., New York, 1949, chaps. 3, 6.

MARTINDELL, JACKSON, *The Scientific Appraisal of Management,* Harper & Brothers, New York, 1950.

MARX, FRITZ MORSTEIN (editor), *Elements of Public Administration,* Prentice-Hall, Inc., New York, 1946, chap. 5.

MCCONNELL, T. T., SCATES, DOUGLAS E., and FREEMAN, FRANK N., *The Conceptual Structure of Educational Research,* Supplemental Educational Monographs, No. 55, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1942.

MILWARD, G. E., *An Approach to Management,* Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1947, part II.

MORT, PAUL R., *Principles of School Administration,* McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., New York, 1946, chap. 16.

PFIFFNER, JOHN M., *Public Administration,* rev. ed., The Ronald Press Company, New York, 1946, chap. 13.

SIMON, HERBERT A., *Administrative Behavior,* The Macmillan Company, New York, 1947, chaps. 1, 2, 3.

TAYLOR, GORDON R., *Are Workers Human?* Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston, 1952, chap. 6.

TRECKER, HARLEIGH, *Group Process in Administration,* The Woman's Press, New York, 1946, chaps. 5, 6.

URWICK, L., *The Elements of Administration,* Harper & Brothers, New York, 1943, chap. 2.

YODER, DALE, *Personnel Management and Industrial Relations,* Prentice-Hall, Inc., New York, 1946, chap. 26.

CHAPTER XI

The Function of Evaluation in Administration

Is it possible that self-evaluation can be detrimental to an individual? What steps must an administrator take to make evaluation a positive rather than a negative process?

Should the purposes of an organization be modified if the means for evaluating them cannot be found?

Is there a conflict between the concept of seniority promotions, merit promotions, and evaluation of personnel? Is it possible or desirable to evaluate personnel when a seniority-experience salary policy is in effect?

How is it possible to make a group responsible for the evaluation and improvement of its members?

Who evaluates an administrator? How can an administrator develop techniques of evaluation that will permit him to discover how his staff and his community evaluate him?

I

During its existence, and in many instances long after it has ceased to exist, an organization is subject to the process of evaluation. Evaluation, or appraisal, is based upon the assumption that actions can be measured and that, in turn, these measurements can be judged against an accepted set of standards or values. It is not always assumed that the measurements are going to be developed by positive quantities such as inches, scores, or quotients. Fundamental to the concept of evaluation, however, is the necessity for

establishing a set of goals, values, standards, purposes, or objectives against which measurements can be made. Evaluation is designed to foster the achievement of the purposes of an organization as well as to provide information which can be used to define and modify its purposes.

The concern of the administrator in the area of evaluation properly begins with efforts to identify and define the purposes of the organization. While for some organizations an end purpose is easily ascertained, for school organizations this is not the case. Purposes in education are not definable in terms of passage from one grade level to another, by a diploma, or by the amount of income that an individual derives ten years after leaving school. Where purposes of an organization are not clearly identifiable in the number of units produced or the net income for the current fiscal year, the problem of evaluation becomes exceedingly complex. In social organization, such as schools, the appraisal of the cumulative effect of these groups upon society may truly be within the domain of the historian.

Evaluation needs to be considered as a part of the total process of administration, for acts of evaluation need to be designed to encompass all administrative acts. It should facilitate growth of a total organization rather than hinder its operations. In a school system, personnel policies need to be evaluated along with student achievement on reading and spelling tests, and the maintenance staff must be appraised by analyzing its effectiveness in expediting the educational process not by the speed in which it causes the building to be cleared of students and teachers. Effectiveness of administration is best appraised by viewing the daily operational results against the over-all purposes of the organization.

There isn't a beginning or an end to the process of evaluation. Evaluation is action that permeates an organization at all stages of its growth. The personnel of an organization cannot wait for a product to be completed before they begin to evaluate. They must start evaluating upon the formation of the organization and from

that point the process must be continuous. Evaluation must be conceived of as a continuous process, for if organizations are to survive they cannot remain static. As an organization functions its progress must be constantly checked, its weak points discovered and corrected, its strengths utilized, and its operations modified by the evaluative evidence available.

Evaluation is not without its dangers since those who evaluate human performance may be opposed by behavior which resists critical analysis. It is exceedingly important to recognize that the psychological security of all those affiliated with an organization must be considered as well as the mechanistic aspects of the evaluative process. Staff members who face a real or imagined threat to their status will not look kindly upon efforts to appraise the individual or the total organization. The administrator must be cognizant of the impact evaluation has upon the people in the organization.

Evaluation needs to be a process that enables the individual to analyze his own position in and contributions to the organization, because the highest form of evaluation is that which gives the individual responsibility for his own actions. To be effective, self-evaluation must consider that each action in an organization should be judged not only by what it does or does not do for the individual but what contribution it makes to the group. Considered as such, evaluation is a process of introspection that is conditioned by the social context in which the individual operates. The task of the administrator is to provide the opportunities and establish the conditions which will encourage self-appraisal.

Self-evaluation is not limited to the individual for it includes groups working as units. The generalizations applicable to individual self-analysis are applicable to group introspection. The group considers its position and contribution to the total organizational effort, and the means by which the evaluation is to take place are considered as a part of group action. Administrators act as an intrinsic part of the group and make their contributions in light of

their unique abilities. The group determines its weaknesses and strengths and then as a group plans its future course of action.

While evaluation is needed in part to offer security to all those affiliated with an organization, it should also furnish a sound basis for public support. In a democratic society, it is believed that the people require pertinent facts before they can make an intelligent decision, and the evaluative process is designed to furnish such information. Working with individuals and through groups, the administrator is faced with the responsibility of bringing together the data which can serve as instructional materials for the public. The process of gathering materials and bringing together all of the data is an administrative responsibility. However, here too, evaluation is not considered as an individual enterprise but as a series of group actions designed to foster the achievement of the organization's goals.

Evaluation is here viewed as a continuous process that is designed to assist an organization in achieving its purposes, provide for the psychological security of its members, secure public understanding and support, and appraise the progress of the organization. It is considered an act that fosters the improvement of individuals and operates from the individual outward. Evaluation is the means by which an objective, reliable, and valid accounting is made of the progress of an organization as its personnel seek to accomplish its purposes.

II

Evaluation must be made an integral part of the operation of an organization and not only an action which is done sporadically as a means of compiling information for an annual report or for securing information requested by a State Department of Education. To be functional the evaluative process must be integrated with the action program of the organization. Continuous appraisals need to be made of the progress of the organization as it moves towards its goals and modifications are made as required. Not only does the act

of evaluating serve as a means of ascertaining the progress of the organization, it also assists the organization to precisely define its purposes. Trecker has carefully analyzed the functional role of evaluation in the administrative process.

> it is the primary function of administration to provide leadership of a continuously helpful kind so that all persons engaged in the manifold workings of the agency may advance the agency to ever more significant service and accomplishment. Continuous evaluation of administrative processes with groups is therefore a necessity.
>
> By evaluation of administration we mean appraisal or judgment of the worth and accomplishment of all the procedures designed to enable the agency to accomplish its objectives. Evaluation is essentially the study and review of past operating experience. It implies critical analysis of the quality of the relationships which have been developed between all groups. It implies a willingness to measure results and to make changes in both goals and methods as a result of considered evidence. Evaluation becomes a resource for the continuous strengthening of all the individuals and groups in the agency setting.
>
> It is important that administration be examined in the same way we evaluate program. Administration is one of the resources for program and it generally controls program extent and quality. Though it may be argued that we cannot evaluate administration apart from program, too often we try to evaluate program without studying the way it is administered. It should be pointed out that evaluation of administration means more than evaluation of administrators though they are one focus of such efforts. Every administrator should furnish tangible evidence of the effectiveness of the processes he uses. The true point of concentration in administrative appraisal is the way the agency groups work together.
>
> There are five reasons for systematic evaluation:
>
> 1. Well-conducted evaluation enables us to discover to what extent our groups separately and together have accomplished their mutual objectives. In such accomplishment it can be assumed that services are being provided which meet the recognized needs of the constituency.

2. Evaluation enables our groups to summarize the results of work together. They are helped to see both strengths and weaknesses and are enabled to discover points at which they need to alter their procedures.
3. Well-planned evaluation helps us to formulate new objectives and to renew our dedication to older objectives not yet attained.
4. Evaluation often forces us to adjust and modernize our methods, thus avoiding the perpetuation of old patterns. A rethinking of administrative procedures is frequently the result of the evaluation program.
5. Evaluation can be a stimulation to greater professional growth. It can be an extension of the learning process because its very nature is scientific and its aim is educational.

As a means of preparing administrators and groups for the acceptance of an evaluative point of view in their work it may be helpful to review certain basic assumptions or principles which underlie evaluation of group activity generally.

1. It is assumed that evaluation is an important step in all group activity and a component part of good administration.
2. Evaluation of group activity must be done in the light of objectives or qualities of group performance we are attempting to achieve.
3. Evaluation must come out of the actual experiences of people working together and, like good administration, must be conducted on a cooperative and democratic basis.
4. The best evaluation is continuous rather than periodic. It has its roots in the desire to improve each situation without waiting for specific review periods.
5. It is assumed that evaluation is directed primarily toward the improvement of the experiences of groups and, as a result of this improvement, toward a better service for the clientele.

Evaluation thus calls for agency leaders who are alert, inquiring and analytical. Their devotion to their work is real because of their willingness to study and improve upon it.

Though evaluation must be related to specific groups in specific

situations, some of the steps in the total process would seem to apply no matter which agency or organization is involved. When we set out to study, evaluate or do research, we need a clear understanding of the objectives of our agency. With clarity at this point the entire job of evaluation is made easier in focus and in process. Beyond objectives we must establish criteria of professional practice for use in judging the results of our work. This takes time but there is no short cut. Having worked out criteria we must think about and state the nature of the evidence for which we are searching as a manifestation of our basic criteria. At this point it becomes necessary to make a choice of the specific parts of administration we intend to study and see the part we have chosen in relation to other problems which may be studied at a later time. A good problem for study is one which holds a maximum of interest for the group called upon to make the study. Good problems can be stated clearly and in terms of an hypothesis.

At this point we are ready for the creation of instruments which we shall use in analyzing our experience and collecting data. Instruments such as questionnaires and schedules call for a substantial amount of technical skill in construction. It is important that these instruments be simple and direct in application. Our next step is the collection of facts by means of our instruments. After collection, then comes analysis.

It is at this point that group discussion is especially needed. It is not surprising that a variety of meanings are often attached to the same sets of data. Interpretation, summarization and the drawings of findings must be considered as a step prior to the making of recommendations. Once recommendations have been made, the application of such recommendations and their use as reflected by changes in objectives and practices round out the process and start us on a new study.

Though it is not possible to present a lengthy list of criteria for evaluation of group processes in administration, this list of ten points may lend itself to elaboration.

1. To what extent are all the groups in the agency achieving a growing understanding of the underlying purposes for which the agency exists?
2. To what extent are all the groups participating in the processes of policy formulation?

3. To what extent are all groups organized for effective assumption of their specific responsibilities?
4. To what extent does each of the groups understand and appreciate the specific responsibilities of the other groups?
5. To what extent do all groups have, and do they make use of, channels of communication with one another?
6. To what extent are groups provided with leadership capable of developing group unity and bringing out the capacities of the members for participation?
7. To what extent do groups utilize operating procedures to make their work experience productive and satisfying for the agency and the group members?
8. To what extent do the groups maintain adequate records of meetings, studies and other activities?
9. To what extent have the groups evaluated their operating procedures and made modifications in keeping with new materials on objectives and methods?
10. To what extent are groups creating a conscious and growing unity with one another so that there is a feeling of cooperative responsibility for the whole agency?[1]

It needs to be recognized that evaluation cannot be only a mechanical process by which surveys, questionnaires, tests, rating scales, observations, and interviews are used to measure the maintenance cost per square foot, the percentage of dropouts, or the quartile scores of various classes. Individuals in the organization are concerned with evaluation in a direct, personal way. Costs, ratings, averages, deviations, and correlations are meaningful to the mathematics teacher, the custodian, the junior class counselor, or the principal in so far as they are involved in the evaluative process. Appraisals cannot be divorced from the humans who may be affected by the results of such appraisals. These considerations are emphasized by Roethlisberger in his study of management and morale.

[1] Harleigh Trecker, *Group Process in Administration.* Copyright, 1946, 1950 by Whiteside, Inc. Pp. 119–123.

The point of view we are recommending suggests that in any business organization there are tensions and strains. Interferences of one kind or another may arise which will make conditions of human unbalance. These interferences and resulting unbalances have to be detected, diagnosed, and dealt with at the time and place in which they occur. Systems of communication cannot be made perfect for all time. Supervisors cannot be harangued or "educated" for all time into being as good at the receiving end as at the transmitting end of the communication system. Employees cannot be harangued or "educated" for all time into understanding the logical and economic purposes of the top management group. Local interferences will and do arise. The channels of communication can and do become blocked.

Ultimately, the dissatisfied individual or disturbing employee or supervisor has to be dealt with. Discharging him or transferring him to some spot where he can do less harm—the personnel organization, for example—is sometimes not the solution. What he may need is just a little help in the direction of understanding his situation. Maybe it is a problem of orientation: Maybe he has just been moved from one department to another and he needs time and understanding to reorient himself to his new situation—not only to the technical requirements of the job, but also to the norms of conduct of the new work group to which he has been assigned. Maybe he has, without quite realizing it, just grown older and has moved from one age or service group to another and must reorient himself to the changes in his relations with older and younger groups.

Perhaps it is a problem of evaluation: Maybe the individual is incorrectly evaluating himself or the situation of which he is a part. Maybe he is making a faulty evaluation of his workers or supervisors. This is leading him to inappropriate decisions and actions. These incorrect or inadequate evaluations are of the utmost importance in the successful functioning of the concern, since they relate not only to the work satisfactions of the individual but also to the selection of people for promotion and, indeed, to all the major decisions made by employees, supervisors, and management.

Our solution for inadequate orientations and evaluations on the part of both workers and supervisors is clear. They can be handled only on the spot; not by pieces of paper emanating from the top floor. For

their adequate treatment, a skill of diagnosis is involved: a skill of understanding a concrete human total situation, of analyzing a complex human phenomenon into those elements which have produced it, analogous to the skill of the medical diagnostician who can go from the symptoms to the realities behind them. It is not a skill of juggling with words and abstractions. It addresses itself to somebody in the concrete, not to somebody or anybody but nobody in particular. It is a skill which is trying to discover what is present in some particular human situation in some particular place at some particular time. It is not interested in what is on a person's mind in general; it is interested in what is on some one person's mind—a person who has had a particular personal history, who was brought up in a particular family which had particular relations to the community, who, as a result of this particular social conditioning, comes to his job with particular hopes and fears and sentiments. Moreover, this person's job is in some particular place in the factory, which brings him into association with particular persons and groups of people; that is, he is in a particular social setting which is making particular demands of him and, as a result of the particular demands which the job is making of him and the particular demands which he is making of the job, there is a particular kind of equilibrium or disequilibrium.[2]

Even as it is recognized that human factors need to be considered in the evaluative process, attention must be given to the basis used by the administrator to appraise his organization. The fundamental concern of the administrator is the efficiency with which the organization strives to achieve its purposes. It is essential to recognize that the standard of efficiency is directly related to the purposes of the organization. The school system that has spotless floors and yet inadequately prepares students for life is not performing at a high level of efficiency. Records, reports, time schedules, teacher loads, bus routes, and textbook distributions are efficiently administered, if, by their use, the educational program is being promoted; conversely, if educational progress is being impeded, then the administrative process is inefficient.

[2] F. J. Roethlisberger, *Management and Morale,* Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1950, pp. 131–133.

The administrator's concern for efficiency need not be incompatible with a sound program of personnel management. It should be understood that the efficiency of an organization bears a direct relationship to the extent to which personnel operate effectively and that any evaluation of the efficiency of an organization would have to be concerned with human values. The relationship between evaluation and efficiency is described by Simon.

it is necessary to consider more closely the exact nature of the propositions of administrative theory. The theory of administration is concerned with how an organization should be constructed and operated in order to accomplish its work efficiently. A fundamental principle of administration, which follows almost immediately from the rational character of "good" administration, is that among several alternatives involving the same expenditure the one should always be selected which leads to the greatest accomplishment of administrative objectives; and among several alternatives that lead to the same accomplishment the one should be selected which involves the least expenditure. Since this "principle of efficiency" is characteristic of any activity that attempts rationally to maximize the attainment of certain ends with the use of scarce means, it is as characteristic of economic theory as it is of administrative theory. The "administrative man" takes his place alongside the classical "economic man."

Actually, the "principle" of efficiency should be considered as a definition rather than a principle: it is a definition of what is meant by "good" or "correct" administrative behavior. It does not tell how accomplishments are to be maximized, but merely states that this maximization is the aim of administrative activity, and that administrative theory must disclose under what conditions the maximization takes place.

Now what are the factors that determine the level of efficiency which is achieved by an administrative organization? It is not possible to make an exhaustive list of these, but the principal categories can be enumerated. Perhaps the simplest method of approach is to consider the single member of the administrative organization, and ask what the limits are to the quantity and quality of his output. These limits

include (a) limits on his ability to perform, and (b) limits on his ability to make correct decisions. To the extent that these limits are removed, the administrative organization approaches its goal of high efficiency. Two persons, given the same skills, the same objectives and values, the same knowledge and information, can rationally decide only upon the same course of action. Hence, administrative theory must be interested in the factors that will determine with what skills, values, and knowledge the organization member undertakes his work.[3]

While the concept of efficiency as an evaluative criterion for administrative purposes appears to be sound, it needs to be recognized that the use of this standard will vary with organizational purpose. Marx in discussing the concept of efficiency describes how differences develop in governmental and business organizations because of the differences in purpose.

Efficiency in administration depends at bottom upon devising and directing a routine, a regimen, a system. We may grant that it is never possible to reduce all components of a process to the point where they can be so handled. It is nevertheless the aim in all management to discover and introduce that division of specialized labor which will enable the total job to be performed most satisfactorily and at the lowest possible cost.

From the standpoint of efficiency, public and private administration are basically alike. They operate under similar types of managerial motivation and compulsion. Many of the sources of red tape in governmental bureaucracy are no different from those which account for the "green tape"—if we may call it that—in business bureaucracy. But the parallel holds true for only part of the way. Administrators in government are obliged to be regardful of some considerations beyond those to which business can limit its concern. These make the government tape red instead of green. Typically they are social—Aristotle would have called them political—considerations as distinguished from economic, and they certainly should figure in public administration.

[3] Herbert A. Simon, *Administrative Behavior,* The Macmillan Company, New York, 1947, pp. 38–39.

Perhaps in some fields the ultimate objectives of public management are identical with those of commercial undertakings, but this is the exception rather than the rule. Government generally aims at ends more complex and more intangible than business. Men look to government for justice, law, peace, and order; for the maintenance of liberty, equality, and opportunity; for impartiality in the enforcement of economic regulations and for even-handedness in the administration of economic assistance—not so much for service that is swift and cheap as for service that is safe and sure. They want such service to be economically efficient. They also want it to satisfy these other and more basic expectations. They do not run their government to make money. They run it in order to establish and preserve an environment in which they themselves can make a decent living. The standard of success in business is the greatest economic gain to the individual entrepreneur or firm at the lowest economic cost. The standard for government is the greatest social-and-economic gain for the public at the lowest social-and-economic cost to all.[4]

An additional consideration involving the use of the efficiency concept as a basis for making evaluations is identified by Dwight Waldo. Addressing himself to this problem as a political scientist, Waldo concludes that there exists a hierarchy of purposes in an organization which in turn creates a necessity for appraising efficiency at the appropriate level of purpose. It might be shown that a teacher is efficiently teaching the diagramming of sentences and yet inefficiently teaching the art of writing. The teacher is merely efficient at one level of teaching and inefficient at another. In the same way an administrator might efficiently organize the routine distribution of supplies and at the same time inefficiently promote the total welfare of the teaching staff. It becomes important for the administrator to recognize the level at which a particular action is taking place and to apply the appropriate criterion.

The concept of *a hierarchy of purposes* may be of value in mediating between the normative and the descriptive aspects of efficiency. At

[4] Fritz Morstein Marx (editor), *Elements of Public Administration,* Prentice-Hall, Inc., New York, 1946, pp. 55–56.

least it holds the promise of being a useful "pragmatic" tool in dealing with efficiency.

The proposal can be stated in the form of a series of theses: that efficiency can be measured at various "levels" of human purpose; that on the "lower levels" the purposes of various individuals and groups are much the same, but that there is increasingly important disparity in purposes entertained, values pursued, in the "higher levels"; that the "efficiency" of various instruments and procedures at the lower levels of purpose is likely to be the same or nearly the same for various persons and groups, because the purposes are the same or nearly the same for various persons and groups, *i.e.* the frame of reference is constant; but that in the higher levels of human purpose the "efficiency" of various instruments and procedures tends to differ because the purposes differ significantly—the frame of reference is not constant. Human purposes range—to go no lower—from the irrational urge to scratch an itch to the noblest promptings of humanitarianism and religion. The measurement of efficiency must take cognizance of this fact.

In practice, the proposed scheme means that the efficiency of various instruments and procedures of a mechanical and routine nature, those that serve "unimportant" purposes *or that serve ends that are important only in terms of other or higher ends,* will be approximately constant in all organizations; but that the less mechanical and routine the instruments and procedures, and the more important *or more nearly ultimate* the purposes they serve, the less likely is their efficiency to be constant. The efficiency of a given typewriter under given operating conditions is the same for all organizations. It is the same for the Eureka Shoe Company as for Field Headquarters of the British Army or for the office staff of the *Daily Worker.* It is the same because the immediate purpose is the same: the production of typewritten words. It is equally clear that the efficiency of a given "span of control" or of a given scheme of centralized purchasing would *not* be the same for these organizations.

Recognition of the hierarchical or pyramidal relationship of the values that men entertain will enable students of administration to make both more accurate and more significant studies in efficiency. Efficiency, it was concluded above, can be measured only in terms of purpose. If one part of the ratio is unknown or obscure, the measure-

> ment cannot be accurate. Statement by a student of the "level" upon which he is proceeding, of the frame of reference which he accepts, will enable others to appraise his results and articulate their studies with his.
>
> We suggest in closing that the notion of a "pyramid of values" may be of value in evolving a new philosophy of the relationship of the student of administration to his subject matter. We have observed how the "politics-administration" dichotomy sprang up to provide the basis for this philosophy, how it caused confusion and contradiction, how it has been increasingly rejected as unrealistic. Through the idea of a "pyramid of values," the rigid division between "politics" and "administration" is replaced by an organic interrelation. This concept recognizes as valid what most students of administration have strongly felt: that there is a realm of "science" where "objectivity" is possible and "efficiency" can be measured. On the other hand, it takes cognizance of the fact that, increasingly, as one's frame of reference widens and disagreement about ends becomes important, "science" and "objectivity" are more difficult, judgments of "efficiency" less accurate, more controversial.[5]

Regardless of the level of purpose and its impact upon the concept of efficiency, it is not possible to use the criterion of efficiency without considering its effects upon the personnel within the organization. Should efficiency be divorced from human considerations it can be detrimental to the organization. Efficiency and morale, however, need not be in opposition, rather they are complementary. While it cannot be generalized that the happy individual in the organization is the most efficient, there would appear to exist a direct relationship between those factors which contribute to high organizational morale and human efficiency. Supporting evidence for this proposition is to be found in the research of the industrial relations specialists. Roethlisberger emphasizes the need for establishing a proper balance between the demands of organizational efficiency and morale.

[5] Dwight Waldo, *The Administrative State,* 1948, The Ronald Press Company, pp. 204–205.

the factors which make for efficiency in a business organization are not necessarily the same as those factors that make for happiness, collaboration, teamwork, morale, or any other word which may be used to refer to cooperative situations. Two different sets of considerations are involved. In securing the first objective, under certain conditions certain useful abstractions from the total situation can be made and applied which take for granted the concrete cooperative situation. In attaining the second objective, cooperative phenomena are of the essence.

The problem is not a choice between two opposing alternatives—between "efficiency" on the one hand, and "morale" on the other; it is a problem of maintaining, under given conditions, a type and kind of equilibrium which will allow for maximum efficiency and collaboration. Now, this is the problem with which any administrator is confronted every day. He is trying to use every method which will cut costs, increase output, improve quality, cut down waste and accidents, and make his department or division technically efficient. At the same time, he is trying to secure the cooperation of individuals in attaining these technical ends. Not only does he have to secure their willingness to contribute their services to these purposes, but also he must see to it that by giving their services to these ends they will obtain social satisfactions which make them continuously desirous of cooperating. Now this is not a static problem of black and white. It is a dynamic problem of equilibrium; it is a problem of knowing the technological limitations, the limitations of the human organization, and the particular objectives that can be accomplished under these limiting conditions. In part, it is a problem of sizing up a situation and knowing what needs to be done and how it should be done here and now in order to attain the cooperative purpose. In part, it is the problem of a constant exercise of judgment in a situation of equilibrium, of assessing its nature, and of spotting possible sources of interference which may unduly disrupt the condition of balance.[6]

The proposition has been advanced that evaluation is an essential function of executive action, and that the criterion of efficiency

[6] F. J. Roethlisberger, *Management and Morale,* Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1950, pp. 156–157.

is used to appraise the progress of the organization as it strives to achieve its purposes. To exercise this function the executive must be cognizant of the multiplicity of methods by which this progress can be measured. In the field of education, administrators should be aware of the potential value and limitations of measurement techniques such as standardized tests, rating scales, surveys, check-lists, inventories, interviews, directed observations, sociograms, anecdotal records, questionnaires, self-rating scales, diaries, and case studies. Each of these devices combined with the analysis of operating data as found in accounting systems, enrollment statistics, and annual reports offer the administrator adequate data for evaluation purposes. The nature of the technique or techniques to be used to appraise any aspect of the life of the organization is dependent upon the objective to be evaluated. The complex nature of the problem of using appropriate evaluation techniques has been considered by Dimock.

The best way to improve the efficiency of an organization is to apply to it the most precise and quantitative units for the measurement of performance that can be devised. It is part of the task of the executive to create as many of these objective and measurable tests of efficiency as possible.

The American Telephone and Telegraph Company has adopted a series of tests by which it judges efficiency and encourages competition among its member companies and its employees. Since this corporation is the largest administrative organization in the country outside the federal government itself, its methods are of particular interest.

One of its checks on efficiency is a test of the elapsed time in completing calls, both on the democratic and on the long lines. If this time can be reduced, then the efficiency of the service is being improved in this respect. This is a stop-watch operation. Another test is the percentage of errors on the part of operators, because this is a factor in providing good service and creating good will. By running controlled tests over a sufficiently long time, each company can tell accurately what the tendency is and whether efficiency is being improved. Again, in the telephone exchanges, trained time and motion experts observe the proper use of arms and limbs in performing the switchboard op-

erator's function, as a result of which attempts are made to standardize the performance of individual operators, increase the net efficiency and at the same time not impose unreasonable demands upon individual employees. Other tests determine whether the voice of an operator is courteous and her inflection clear, her tone pleasing to the auditor. This is another aspect of the service rendered and has a marked effect on the attitude of the customer, because if he likes the operator's voice he feels he is getting his money's worth, while if it irritates him he damns the whole company.

These units of measurement of administrative performance make it possible to provide the equivalent of competition in an enterprise that is a regulated monopoly. The problem of the Bell officials was to create as many reliable tests as possible in erecting comparisons between operating companies. It might be assumed that the principal criteria would be financial; but frequently, on analysis, it turns out that these are less reliable than some others. If, for example, the Ohio System makes a higher net profit than the New Jersey System and each telephone earns a higher net return, this does not necessarily mean that the former is the more efficient from a managerial standpoint. It may mean one of several things, from a more tolerant regulatory commission to customers who are less articulate. Tests that measure elapsed time in completing calls and the percentage of errors are more illuminating from the standpoint of valid comparison. Then there are other measurements which can be applied in other departments. What, for example, is the average time required in erecting telephone poles under substantially similar circumstances? How long does it take a crew of the same size to string an equal number of feet of wire? How much wastage occurs in the use of materials? How much error is turned up in the making of new installations?

Each department in an enterprise should create its own objective tests. The responsibility of the chief executive is to see that the department head is on his job and that tests are established in the first place, faithfully carried out, and continually refined. An important aspect of his work is to follow these tests assiduously and to keep constantly informed on the curve of performance. If the efficiency curve is up and the complaint curve down, then he can be assured that his organization is doing its job.

It might be supposed that an agency such as the RMO, which was chiefly concerned with a personnel program rather than a mechanical product such as a telephone, might have had some difficulty in creating and using reliable units for administrative performance tests. Experience, however, proved the contrary. Vessel delays relative to size of fleet continued to diminish, and referrals to merchant ships via the RMO port offices continued to expand, as did the number of registrants with the RMO for immediate assignment. The methods used in the recruitment program were steadily improved, with the result that after a time almost as many men were recruited in four months as in twelve months at the outset, while administrative costs attributable to recruitment, manning, Selective Service, and convalescent rest center operations showed a steady decline, due in part to the increased volume of work and in part to improved efficiency.

A problem of administrative control is to break a general test down into its parts in order that efficiency may be still further reduced to measurable terms. Take, for example, the question of the net cost of recruiting a unit of manpower for the merchant marine. It is made up of components such as the salaries of those engaged in this work, items such as travel and telephone, the expense of advertising and of transportation, plus a pro rata share of the administrative costs of the organization as a whole. The problem of the director of the Recruitment Division, therefore, was to analyze the figures developed by the statistical office in order to discover more about each of these items. Take, for instance, the cost of advertising: for every dollar spent on metropolitan dailies, how many men were made available? How does this unit cost compare with the results of advertising in rural weekly newspapers? Or take a comparison that is even more significant, between the unit cost of results produced by newspaper advertising and radio programs —which is the more effective instrument? With this information at hand, the head of the recruitment program could see just how he needed both media, the newspaper having one kind of appeal and the radio another. In a well-run organization, the executive must know, by the comparison of results, exactly what he gets for each dollar spent.

One way to improve efficiency is to reduce output and performance to measurable units. Here it may be objected that efficiency is more than a matter of quantification, that it is equally, and perhaps even

more importantly, a matter of morale. Certainly this is true, but I would underscore the value of both factors, for they are complementary rather than exclusive. Indeed, my own experience indicates that one of the best ways of improving morale is to give employees the assurance and self-confidence which comes from knowing how well they are doing in terms that can be measured and seen. An employee acquires satisfaction from the knowledge that his performance is improving. Also he is more likely to get due credit for greater effort and ability, both from his fellow employees and his boss, if his output is capable of objective measurement.

It may be objected that if quantification is overemphasized, there may be a tendency to neglect quality for quantity. The answer to this is that tests can and should be devised to measure quality, just as the Bell System, for example, is interested in the tone of voice of its operators. The same thought is exemplified in the attention which the RMO gave to providing full and efficient crews, in addition to avoiding ship delays. The full and efficient manning of a ship became the qualitative consideration.

We had various means of checking on the quality of the officers and men whom we supplied. One source of information was the Coast Guard which was responsible for disciplinary matters. By analyzing a representative group of such cases and determining where those particular individuals had originated—whether from our own agency or from a maritime labor union, from the training program or from among the experienced men attracted back to the sea—we were able to get some idea of the qualitative job we were doing. We also found that periodic inquiries of ship's operators, captains, and the union officials gave us much reliable data. Another source was the reports of our agents stationed abroad in such places as the United Kingdom or North Africa, for, as so many Americans had opportunity to learn during the heyday of the tourist movement to Europe, the normal restraints upon individual behavior are sometimes removed when one finds oneself on a foreign shore. Hence if seamen were going to become what we called "performers" at all, they could be expected to do so when they got to some distant country. This our overseas men could note and report on.

The attempts to objectify administrative performance are undesir-

able if they result in overlooking the importance of the spirit that flows through an organization and gives in its personality and appeal. As has been said, however, quantification and a due appreciation of these spiritual factors are not mutually exclusive. A disgruntled employee is never an efficient employee. An organization of disgruntled employees can destroy a business in a short time. In any large organization there are relationships similar to those between individuals. Either it is one of sincerity, mutual respect, and good will, or it is the opposite of these. There is no necromancy about a large enterprise. It is simply a multiplication of the individual and of simple relationships between one person and another. To be sure, an institution is more than the sum of its components because it comes to have institutional ways of doing things, institutional resistances, an institutional spirit, and idiosyncrasies. This, however, does not disprove the argument just advanced. The foundation of industrial relationships is individual relationships. If the executive is a kind and generous man in his personal habits, he will probably follow the same pattern in his official life. This seems clear enough when you stop to think about it but unfortunately we do not do that as much or as often as we should.[7]

Evaluation needs to be considered as a continuous action process. The purpose of evaluation is not to collect data which can be appropriately filed alphabetically. Evaluation should be synonymous with action, the actions of the executive dependent upon the evaluative process. Purpose, program, evaluation, the spiral continues as the organization constantly moves towards its goals. The executive activates the process and his success is directly proportional to the success of the organization in achieving its purposes.

Objectives are defined, plans made, and the cycle proceeds. However, no one is omniscient and, hence, all accomplishments must be measured in terms of plans made, and all plans in terms of some other procedure and of the cost of accomplishment. This is the problem of appraisal or valuation: part of the judicial function. The executive who is charged with the authority and responsibility cannot actually take the final ac-

[7] Marshall E. Dimock, *The Executive in Action,* Harper & Brothers, New York, 1945, pp. 143–147.

tion. That is done by someone else to whom authority has been delegated, perhaps through several steps. Authority also carries with it responsibility to respond, to answer for the use of authority. Orders have been given to do a certain thing or set of things. Whether the orders have been enabling or directive, the results obtained must be appraised by the executive. He judges in terms of how well the objectives set were attained and of how much they cost in men, money, material, and time.

Appraisal is followed by a comparison with the goal and objectives, an investigation and analysis. Finally, if necessary, there is a revision of the plans which leads eventually to a repetition of the cycle. The procedure involved in revision is a reorganization, a recoordination, with naturally new and additional investigation and analysis. Perhaps there is a reappraisal of the information previously obtained. It may include even a change of staffing or a redefinition of duties, authority, and responsibility. Finally, there is the issuance of new commands and reintegration. Here trusteeship is sitting in judgment on the results of its own decisions. There is a noticeable tendency in modern management to make decisions continuously and through records and reports watch the results of these decisions. This makes possible the alteration of plans before completion and tends to more successful accomplishment. Thereafter this process should be continuously repeated, if an organization is to continue to operate successfully in this competitive world.[8]

III

As effectively stated by Troyer: "Evaluation is the process of making judgments and coming to decisions. In education, the focus of this process is on the goals, status, and progress of human beings. The consequences of evaluation depend not alone on the decisions derived, but also on the nature of the human relationships in the process."[9]

The school executive cannot delegate the responsibility for eval-

[8] Robert T. Livingston, *The Engineering of Organization and Management*, McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., New York, 1949, p. 75.

[9] Maurice E. Troyer, "Accuracy and Validity in Evaluation Are Not Enough," The J. Richard Street Lecture for 1947, Syracuse University, Syracuse, New York, July 24, 1947, p. 3.

uation, even though the mechanics can be assigned to business managers, research directors, assistant superintendents, supervisors, or teachers. The chief executive often does delegate responsibility for the appraisal of units within the organization to the head of each unit; however, the responsibility still remains with the chief executive because the public holds him responsible for the activities of the system.

No area of public school activity is immune from the evaluative process. School building programs, effectiveness of the educational program, the mops used by the custodians, and the executive's office are all subject to evaluation. As each area or phase of the system's activities are studied, the standard for judgment must be the efficiency with which each organizational element or activity contributes to the progress of the organization as it moves towards its goals. Human values are not subordinated to a mechanistic robot of efficiency—efficiency is the condition by which human growth is permitted to reach its greatest fulfillment.

The function of evaluation in educational organizations has been expertly summarized by Troyer and Pace.

What is evaluation in education? It is the process of judging the effectiveness of educational experience. It includes gathering and summarizing evidence on the extent to which educational values are being attained. It seeks to answer the questions: "What progress am I making?" and "What success is our educational program having?" Teachers, administrators, and students are daily making value judgments about the effectiveness of their procedures in the attainment of their goals. Thus evaluation, whether recognized as such or not, goes on continuously in all education.

Evaluation makes use of measurement but is not synonymous with it. How do the two differ? Measurement refers only to observations that can be expressed quantitatively. It is concerned with the question of "how much." Evaluation recognizes the need to know how much but it is especially concerned with the question of "what value." This emphasis upon *values* distinguishes evaluation most clearly. Evaluation presupposes a definition of goals to be attained; the evaluator draws

upon any source of evidence, quantitative or qualitative or descriptive, that may be useful in judging the degree to which those objectives are attained.

What are the tasks involved in the process of evaluation? Obviously, one is the formulation of objectives. What goals am I trying to reach? What are the purposes of this course? What aim are we seeking to realize in our educational program? Usually a statement of objectives is somewhat abstract. We say we want students or teachers to think critically, to develop wholesome personalities, to become responsible citizens. But precisely what do we mean by responsible citizenship, wholesome personality, or critical thinking? What does a person do who is a responsible citizen? What behavior do we look for in deciding whether one possesses a wholesome personality? General objectives therefore, must be defined more sharply in terms of the specific behavior implied by them. This is the second main task in evaluation. A third task is to identify the sources of evidence we can use in observing such behavior. Where shall we look to find evidence of responsible citizenship? What are some of the opportunities students have to display responsible citizenship? A fourth task is to develop methods for getting the evidence we want. We may discover tests, rating scales, questionnaires, and other instruments that will serve our purpose. We may need to construct new forms. Or we may need to work out some scheme of first hand observation, some method of collecting anecdotes, some way of pooling judgments. Finally, we must interpret the results we gather in the light of our goals or objectives. This fifth task requires summarizing and integrating a variety of evidence. It requires considering the degree of confidence we can place in that evidence. It is, in short, the task of making the best possible judgment concerning the meaning and importance of our data. These, then, are five major tasks in the process of evaluation. This is not to say that everyone who evaluates engages in these five tasks consciously and deliberately, nor that the process of evaluation is a fixed sequence of steps. It is to say, however, that what people do when they evaluate can be classified and analyzed in some such manner as we have suggested.

What are some of the purposes and values of evaluation? Why do we evaluate? One very clear reason is in order to judge the effectiveness of an educational program. The unit for evaluation may encom-

pass the total offerings of a college, it may be a single course, or it may be a fairly coherent aspect of a total program—such as general education, student teaching, or orientation and güidance. We undertake to evaluate the program because we hope thereby to improve it. By knowing its strengths and weaknesses we are enabled to plan more intelligently for its improvement. Similarly, we may evaluate the progress of an individual—ourself or someone else. And again, we do it because we hope thereby to advance progress, to attain greater success because we have found out what was holding us back. We know that knowledge of results aids us in learning new skills. So likewise, an evaluation of our status and progress helps us to improve that status and to make further progress. By analyzing our experience, resources, and programs we help to clarify them and to bring our efforts more directly in line with our purposes. Thus evaluation is a technique that can and should lead to the continuous improvement of education.

The varieties of evaluation can be summarized briefly. There is evaluation of individual progress, of single courses, of total programs or major parts thereof. There is evaluation in regular or normal settings and in experimental settings. There is evaluation as an ongoing, continuous activity and evaluation that is periodic. And there is self-evaluation and evaluation by others.[10]

In the current era, the last half of the twentieth century, the public schools have been challenged to provide an educational pattern that will assist society to meet the problems of an atomic age. As public school personnel seek to develop a program which will satisfy this need, they are being challenged to support their decisions. School patrons—living at a time when each succeeding scientific and technological event appears to make living infinitely more complex—seek in the school, as well as in the home and church, the stability that makes for peace of mind. If the school organization also changes rapidly, one element of stability tends to be destroyed and individuals in society may become distressed and question the wisdom of such action. When the explanations for the

[10] Maurice E. Troyer and C. Robert Pace, *Evaluation in Teacher Education,* American Council on Education, Washington, D.C., 1944, pp. 1–7.

changes are not forthcoming or are not understood, the distress may erupt into crisis. It is not strange, therefore, to find many school executives and school activities under attack by individuals and groups in society. A condition has been permitted to develop in which the community has not had the proper opportunity to evaluate the school system, and the school executive has not correctly appraised the attitudes and understandings of the community. It is not surprising that criticisms have developed, what is perhaps more surprising is that far more criticisms have not developed.

The preventative inoculation against the disease of perennial crises is to provide all those concerned with the operation of the school system the evidence which will permit them to understand what is taking place. It is for this important reason, as well as those expressed by Troyer and Pace, that the evaluative process must be understood by the administrator. We need to consider each of the tasks of evaluation as cooperative action by which means administrators, teachers, students, and the community can better understand the operation of the school system. The formulation of objectives, the collecting of evidence, the determination of the means by which the evidence is to be collected, and the interpretation of evidence are tasks which not only provide evidence of organizational progress but in the case of school systems provide the means by which public support can be secured. This then is a responsibility of the administrator, a responsibility to secure the cooperation which is so necessary if evaluation is not to be confined to a fact-finding process by which means another filing cabinet can be filled. It is a responsibility that cannot be delegated.

REFERENCES

APPLEBY, PAUL H., *Big Democracy,* Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., New York, 1945, chap. 5.

BARNARD, CHESTER I., *The Functions of the Executives,* Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1948, chaps. 4, 5.

BENNE, KENNETH D., and MUNTYAN, BOZIDAR, *Human Relations in Curriculum Change,* The Dryden Press, New York, 1951.

DIMOCK, MARSHALL E., *The Executive in Action,* Harper & Brothers, New York, 1945, chap. 12.

DIMOCK, MARSHALL E., *Free Enterprise and the Administrative State,* University of Alabama Press, University, Alabama, 1951, chap. 4.

FAYOL, HENRI, *General and Industrial Management,* Sir Isaac Pitman & Sons, Ltd., London, 1949, chap. 5.

GARDNER, BURLEIGH B., and MOORE, DAVID G., *Human Relations in Industry,* rev. ed., Richard D. Irwin, Inc., Chicago, 1950, chap. 5.

GAUS, JOHN MERRIMAN, *Reflections on Public Administration,* University of Alabama Press, University, Alabama, 1947, chap. 6.

HILLMAN, ARTHUR, *Community Organization and Planning,* The Macmillan Company, New York, 1950, chap. 16.

KILLEFFER, D. H., *The Genius of Industrial Research,* Reinhold Publishing Company, New York, 1948, chap. 13.

LIVINGSTON, ROBERT T., *The Engineering of Organization and Management,* McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., New York, 1949, chap. 5.

MARTINDELL, JACKSON, *The Scientific Appraisal of Management,* Harper & Brothers, New York, 1950.

MARX, FRITZ MORSTEIN (editor), *Elements of Public Administration,* Prentice-Hall, Inc., New York, 1946, chaps. 3, 22.

MCCONNELL, T. R., SCATES, DOUGLAS E., and FREEMAN, FRANK N., *The Conceptual Structure of Educational Research,* Supplemental Educational Monographs, No. 55, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1942.

PFIFFNER, JOHN M., *Public Administration,* rev. ed., The Ronald Press Company, New York, 1946, chap. 13.

ROETHLISBERGER, F. J., *Management and Morale,* Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1950, chaps. 7, 8.

SIMON, HERBERT A., *Administrative Behavior,* The Macmillan Company, New York, 1947, chap. 9.

SOMERVELL, HUBERT, *Industrial Peace in Our Time,* The Macmillan Company, New York, 1950, chap. 23.

TRECKER, HARLEIGH, *Group Process in Administration,* The Woman's Press, New York, 1946, chap. 7.

WALDO, DWIGHT, *The Administrative State,* The Ronald Press Company, New York, 1948, chap. 10.

CHAPTER XII

Emerging Theory in School Administration

I

School administration, as a field of activity in education, has not yet reached its professional coming of age. In many ways, its lack of maturity is made evident to the student of school administration as well as to the practitioner even while a considerable body of professional literature has grown up about it. The workers in the field of educational administration have come far, it is true, from the time not so long ago when professional leadership in the public schools meant only an academic headship of a single school with most administrative matter, other than that immediately concerned with classroom instruction, left in the hands of members of lay boards of education. The early superintendent of schools was often not a professional in any sense and served without having had either teaching experience or educational preparation of any kind. He was sometimes but a part-time agent of the school board acting as an inspector of school properties and activities but with no authority to attempt improvement of the educational program being offered. Where and when the superintendency came to be filled by persons of educational experience and competency, long steps toward the full development of the position of school administrator were taken. The development has continued, and at present there are encouraging signs of the professionalization toward which public educators (superintendents of

schools, principals, and others) have been working. As this is written, however, the vocational maturity of the public school administrator in America is not at hand.

But while concern is expressed for the professional maturing of administrative leadership in education, it should be recognized that it is undesirable for professionalization of the public school administratorship to lead in the direction of an administrator becoming a professional as a *school administrator.* Such a development would be as unfortunate as professionalization of other teachers as *kindergarten teachers, social studies teachers, or guidance teachers.* The splinterization of the educational profession into groups often apparently acknowledging no common animating purposes has led to rivalries serving no good ends as secondary school teachers have held themselves apart from elementary school teachers and college teachers have stood apart from both. Too commonly expressed is the concept of a dichotomy of those who teach and those who administer, as though teachers do not also administer and administrators do not also share in the general function of the school, which is to teach. It is rather to be desired that all who teach, whether classroom teacher or administrator, generalist or specialist, be professionalized as *educators* engaged in a great scheme of education reaching from the kindergarten through the university and from early childhood through adulthood.

The profession of educator is an old and honorable one. Through the centuries its members have made their mark as persons of more than ordinary worth to society. The profession is large in number of members in our time, and within its ranks can walk together in dignity and mutual respect, toward the common end of education devoted to the service of mankind, the beginning teacher in the smallest school and the respected professor of long experience in the largest university. The stipulation for their membership in the profession of educator is that their service be professionally competent and professionally dedicated. No greater development can there be than for the administrator to become a

professional *educator* and for school administration to become a fully professional *educational* activity. The administrator as administrator only and administration as administration only have no reason for being and have no call upon the consideration of educators.

The charge that public school administration is not yet a mature professional activity is a serious one. If true, it indicates that all concerned in the field of school administration must be held to be functioning at a lower than acceptable level of efficiency and effectiveness. It suggests that public education in America is not being served to the best advantage by its administrative processes and that as a consequence the full accomplishment of its objectives is in jeopardy. The charge is not that school administration lacks in itself the stuff of professional educational maturity, but that it has not yet begun to serve education as a whole in the manner in which it should be served in our society. The charge of professional immaturity against school administration does, however, suggest the holding of a belief that through the further development of the administrative processes, public education will achieve those things which are now only dreamed of by educators. If public school administration were not so fundamental to public education, the charge against it could be taken less seriously and the hope expressed for its eventual accomplishments would be much more restrained.

With much of public school administration as we see it now we can be pleased. It serves in many instances very well in the provision of desirable educational experiences for children and others under conditions conducive to their learning and general welfare. School administrators have offered and continue to offer in many ways effective leadership toward the important and primary ends of education. From feeble beginnings a century and more ago to the present time, the organization and administration of public education in the United States have been significant and inspiring. One needs only to contrast with the present the educational oppor-

tunity for Americans a century ago, or even a half century ago, to appreciate the accomplishment of educational administration in the service of the nation. The wonder is how far we have come in a comparatively short time. The danger is that we may become so complacent about public education as it has developed that we may permit school administration to fail to realize its potentialities.

Fundamental to the maturing of public school administration as a field of professional activity in education is basic theory upon which the processes and procedures of administration can be built. Such basic theory is as yet undeveloped for the most part although signs of its emergence are sometimes to be observed. It is perhaps because of impatience with theorizing and because of eagerness to get at practical applications of our knowledge that we overlook the essential practicality of sound theory out of which sound practice can be developed. Theory may, of course, have its genesis in practice as well as practice its genesis in theory. This often justifies the search of tested practice for the theory which underlies it. It does not justify the all too common attempt to establish specific practice as being proper and desirable because of its wide employment. In the latter case, there is no ground upon which to develop practice since even the improper and undesirable may be widely distributed and error may be common to many situations. But whenever, wherever, and however we turn to find the integrating factor in administration, the identification and development of basic theory are important concerns in the maturing of the administrative activity. The theorist will eventually have his day and only with it can we hope to have practice which is consistent within itself and consistent with the ends it is hoped that it will serve.

II

There are those who have served and those who are serving in the development of theory in school administration and without whose work the present development of the art and science of administration would not have been possible. In the United States,

the contributions of Horace Mann to public school organization must be recognized as being foundational to significant contributions of others. He found public education in a state of chaos organizationally. He undertook to bring order out of the chaos and succeeded in systematizing the schools of his time. Upon his work, the present graded school system rests.

Ellwood P. Cubberley identified the role of the public school administrator and established the order of his duties. Through his service and the service of the Engelhardts and others, the superintendency of public schools became a position of consequence and respectability and the superintendent became a fixture in school organization.

Arthur B. Moehlman, in keeping with the educational thinking of more recent years, urged the primacy of the instructional aspects of schools over the administrative and did much to establish the principle that school administration is a service function to the teacher-learner situation.

Paul R. Mort and others have seen administration of schools in the light of changing community needs and have seen the desirability of schools adapting to requirements of present-day society. In this way, schools are to anticipate their continuing modification in the interest of better serving the purposes for which they were established and are maintained. The prospect of the school's furnishing leadership in a developing society is offered as a challenge to public school administrators.

Mort, Reeves, Sears, and some others have recognized the kinship of public school administration to administration in other areas, though the purposes served are quite different. To this end, the contributions of Ordway Tead and Luther Gulick with other persons in and out of public education can be noted. It is not that these men and others who might be listed with them have developed theory and have counseled practice out of their own thinking and experience. For the most part, they have served as the instruments through which professional opinion and thinking

could be formulated and carried on and through which slowly growing professional concepts could be given voice. But in their sensitivity to the moving and growing of public education in the United States, they were and are able to lead the development of the administrative activity in directions promising to serve public education more and more adequately.

Through the work of these persons and many more who have been influential in one way and another, a body of theory foundational to administration in modern public education would seem to be appearing. That such a body of theory cannot be clearly identified and detailed suggests only that its development is still largely prospective and that the serious study of many more students of administrative theory will be required. It may be expected, of course, that at no time will administrative theory be developed once and for all. But the maturing of school administration as a professional activity in education is dependent upon the greater development of the basic theory through which administrative practice may acquire the internal consistency and integration lacking at present.

III

Foundational theory in school administration would seem to be prospective through the study of two problems or lines of investigation. Each appears removed from the immediate interest of the practitioner (should he not also be a theorist) but occupies the attention of the theorist out of whose work will develop the tasks, means, and processes of the practicing school administrator. The first problem has been the concern of this book. It may be stated in simplified form as: What are the common bases of administration wherever it may appear in human affairs? Through attempts to answer the question, it may be discovered that there are an art and a science of administration, each resting upon principles which can be identified and employed in developing further understanding of how administration may serve whatever ends it is called

upon to serve. The process of administration could come into its own as a way through which people work together in harmonious relationship with their environment. That this book promises only an *approach* to this problem suggests the authors' belief that while much useful study has been accomplished by students of administration, there is yet a long way to go before more than tentative answers to this problem are possible.

The other problem which must engage the serious student of school administration is the large one of establishing the role of school administration through identifying the philosophical foundations of the whole public educational enterprise in a changing society. The solution of this problem is at any time a large order, but it is made more difficult by the fact of continuous change in the factors which must be dealt with. The task is therefore a continuous one, but one through which the fundamentals of school administration should be discovered as persisting through time though being always regarded as tentative. The relationship between educational administration and educational philosophy may be expressed: That which we must do develops out of that which we believe fundamentally.

The statement of a group of public school teachers at Drake University illustrates an attempt to relate basic beliefs about education and necessary outcomes in practice.

In affirmation of our belief in the significance of education and the importance of our profession, we declare:

1. Good education is the maximum development of the individual's capacities, ideals, and vision in an intellectually moral society.
2. Good education involves desirable integration of the educative influences of all phases of community life.
3. A primary obligation of every teacher is the teaching for improved living for all peoples.
4. The defense of individual freedom under democracy is a continuous need in every circumstance of in-school and out-of-school living.

5. Good schools lead in solving community problems.
6. The good teacher is concerned with all things which concern the child.
7. The good teacher keeps the spirit of adventure alive in his work.
8. The good teacher accepts responsibility for the advancement of the profession.
9. Education in a democracy requires continuous experiencing of democratic living.
10. Education developing a brotherhood of understanding is the only hope for a peaceful world.

In keeping with the above statements, we desire in all schools:
thoroughly democratic school administration with active participation of teachers;
democratic living in all school experiences;
social activities open to all students without restriction as to religion, color, nationality, or economic status;
student government;
adult education in vocational, cultural, and other areas;
parent study groups;
parent-teacher organizations;
community use of school libraries, classrooms, gymnasiums, auditoriums, grounds, and other school facilities and equipment;
continuous study of community problems of health, housing, recreation, government, and all social relationships;
leadership in community improvement;
activity in the conservation of natural resources;
full discussion of international, social, economic, and political relationships;
pre-school and school health programs with periodic and complete physical examinations;
educational, vocational, and personal guidance;
continuing study and evaluation of the school programs by the teaching staff;
experimentation in ways of teaching;
introduction of new methods, courses, areas of study, and activities to meet the needs of students and a changing society;
a firm faith in the importance of the educational tasks being performed

and a continuous striving on the part of all teachers for the accomplishment of the great objectives of education for all persons.[1]

Another illustration of an approach to this problem is afforded by a committee report of the National Conference of Professors of Educational Administration.

Declarations of Fundamental Beliefs

The dedication of ourselves to public education and to the preparation of school administrators in particular requires, in proper concern for the ordering of our efforts, the acceptance, in full understanding, of a comprehensive structure of fundamental beliefs. Out of these beliefs, should our efforts be well-directed, may be expected to be developed principles and postulates guiding the further efforts toward the preparation of school administrators. Lacking such grounding, our efforts must be ill-directed and become productive of good only by happenstance and not intention.

application of intelligence to life problems

One, we assert man's ability to improve his status through the application of intelligence to his life problems of whatever kind. As a corollary, we affirm that all men share in this ability.

This faith is basic to our support of universal education and to universal public education in particular.

necessity of social group action

Two, we affirm, supported by research and experimentation, that the improvement of living is best to be secured through people working together, that individual thinking and action while necessary to be done and necessarily precursive of group thinking and action is, in that it is partial, to that degree untrustworthy in itself.

This affirmation is basic to our holding that (within the limits of a democratic society) group discipline over individual is desirable and proper, and that the governing are responsible to the governed. We recognize, likewise,

[1] Report of study committee, Drake University, 1948. Unpublished.

that determination of ends in the interest of social good is to be secured most likely in particular and always in general through group communication and action.

respect for the individual

Three, we declare that essential to one and two above is the coming into full being of each individual according to his nature and potentialities.

This is the basis of respect for the individual human personality and the dedication of the educator, whether teacher or administrator, to the individual concerns of each person whom the school touches in its programs. It is the basis for the provision in schools of special services of many kinds, for cooperative supervision, for example, and for democratic relationships through the school organization and activity.

functional social organization

Four, we recognize that fundamental to the life of man as a social being is organization for collective achievement. We recognize further that organization in itself has no reality but is to be understood only in terms of the ends, immediate and remote, for which the organization was created.

This means that as the ends of education change so educational organization must change and that educational leadership must promote the continuous study of organization and the maintenance of fluidity in each organizational structure.

administrator a group instrument

Five, we assert as a corollary to number four above, that school administration stimulated by the group needs, interests, and desires is a process for which particular organization was created and that the individual administrator is an agent of the group or groups which are to be served.

This is the basis for holding that the administrator is a facilitating and serving agent to the learning situation in being when teacher and pupil come together in common educational purpose.

freedom of communication

Six, we believe that administration has always as its immediate task the maintenance of constant, multiple-way communication throughout the organizational structure, that in public education this means the ready flow of ideas among all persons in the school-community, understood as groups within a single school, a system of schools, and the community apart from the school.

This is the basis for our contention for multiple-way obligations and privileges in school public relations in an idealized community school.

administrator as leader

Seven, we believe that as administration is the stimulating force to the process for which a social organization is created and that as the administrator is the agent of the group or groups in the administering of schools, the administrator shares importantly in the group-given charge to administration to work toward the ends for which the organization was set up.

This is the basis for our holding that school administration is educational leadership and that the administrator needs to have a "supervision" of the distant ends being sought. It is likewise the basis for our declaration that educational leadership is group-assigned and not seized from the group. It supports also the contention that leadership does not remove the leader from the group and that, for example, the school administrator as a leader of teachers is a teacher among teachers.

administrator as educator

Eight, in keeping with number seven above, and in keeping with the belief that the ends of education are the significant objects of administration, we hold that the primary task of the educational administrator is leadership toward curricular accomplishment.

This is the basis for our contention that the education of the prospective administrator should be strongly purposed toward his gaining understanding of education generally together with competence as a fine teacher, and secondarily toward the "kitchen" details of administration.

dedication of public education to community betterment

Nine, we hold further that the school administrator shares largely in the responsibility of public education to serve importantly in the bettering of democratic society.

This is the basis for our thinking of educational leadership as of greater scope than that afforded by the physical limits of the school plant or the limits of usual school attendance. It is the basis for our contention that schools should make a difference in the community.

school-community integration in education

Ten, as a corollary to number nine above, we believe that public education, formally organized, is part only of the educational processes of social living and that the public school in the interest of greater accomplishment through common effort, desirably should share its activity with other social institutions and should encourage other institutions to join in a common educational undertaking.

This is the basis for our school-and-community interest and the development of such aspects of the extended use of resources of both school and community, and the community-identified curriculum.

two-fold evaluation of administration

Eleven, we believe that appraisal of administration, as of the whole educational activity, must lie in the terms of process and of outcomes.

Means and ends cannot be evaluated separately. How we do what we do conditions the ends which will be secured and, since the ends of the educational effort are often far removed and subtle in character, appraisal of administration through study of outcome alone is not practicable.

professional integrity and responsibility

Twelve, we believe that the school administrator desirably should be agent in the shaping of administration as a professional activity and personally and collectively responsible for the discipline of administrators in the larger social interest.

This is founded upon our conviction that the tasks of school administration are to be developed cooperatively by lay and professional people and by both preparing institutions and practicing administrators whose concern is the greater serving of society through professional activity dedicated to the public interest.

necessity for professional growth

Thirteen, we believe that, as the tasks of public education multiply in a more and more complex world, the administrator must develop, in pre-service and in-service experience, as a master educator.

This is the basis for our program of preparation and development of school administrators and for our feeling that in working in the field of public school administration we have an occupation of enormous social significance.[2]

[2] National Conference of Professors of Educational Administration, Report of Subcommittee on Philosophy, 1951, Orin Graff and Harlan L. Hagman, chairmen. Unpublished report.

Such lists can become meaningless and inapplicable generalities, yet they suggest the possibility of discovering bases for administrative activity in the commitments of public education to fundamental beliefs about society and the role of education in serving it. If administration is dedicated to public education in an on-going society, the nature and process of administration will be conditioned by the philosophical foundations of that education and hence the importance of the examination of those foundations.

Toward the solution of the two problems noted above as promising much to the theorist in school administration, three agencies may be expected to be of direct or indirect assistance in the years immediately ahead: The National Conference of Professors of Educational Administration, The Cooperative Project in Educational Administration (sponsored by the W. K. Kellogg Foundation), and the American Association of School Administrators. These agencies have participated in studies related to theory in school administration, although results are yet to be determined. Under such auspices and through the additional help of individual students of school administration, the study of the role and practice of administrative leadership in schools goes on. Perhaps the day may be approaching when, possessed of a body of sound basic theory supporting sound practice, public school administration as a field of activity in education may be said to have reached its professional coming of age.

REFERENCES

ALLEN, FREDERICK LEWIS, *The Big Change,* Harper & Brothers, New York, 1952.

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS, *The American School Superintendency,* Thirtieth Yearbook, The Association, Washington, D.C., 1952, chaps. 1, 2, 3, 17.

BARTKY, JOHN A., *Supervision as Human Relations,* D. C. Heath and Company, Boston, 1953.

BERKSON, I. B., *Education Faces the Future,* Harper & Brothers, New York, 1943.

BIXLER, ROY W., and BIXLER, GENEVIEVE K., *Administration for Nursing Education,* G. P. Putnam and Sons, New York, 1954, chaps. 3, 4, 5, 6, 7.

CAMPBELL, CLYDE M., *Practical Applications of Democratic Administration,* Harper & Brothers, New York, 1952, chaps. 1, 2, 3, 4, 13.

CHILDS, JOHN L., *Education and Morals,* Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., New York, 1950.

COUNTS, GEORGE S., *Education and American Civilization,* Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, 1952.

EDUCATIONAL POLICIES COMMISSION, *Education for All American Youth—A Further Look,* National Education Association, Washington, D.C., 1952.

HAGMAN, HARLAN L., *The Administration of American Public Schools,* McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., New York, 1951, chaps. 1, 4, 22, 23.

HART, JOSEPH K., *Education in the Humane Community,* Harper & Brothers, New York, 1951.

LILIENTHAL, DAVID, *This I Do Believe,* Harper & Brothers, New York, 1949.

MILLER VAN, and SPALDING, WILLARD B., *The Public Administration of American Schools,* World Book Company, Yonkers-on-Hudson, New York, 1952, chaps. 1, 7, 19, 23.

MOEHLMAN, ARTHUR B., *School Administration,* 2d ed., Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston, 1951, Part One.

MORT, PAUL R., *Principles of School Administration,* McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., New York, 1946.

NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF PROFESSORS OF EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION, *Educational Leaders, Their Function and Preparation,* Second Report, Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, 1948.

NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF PROFESSORS OF EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION, *Providing and Improving Administrative Leadership for America's Schools,* Fourth Report, Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, 1951.

PITTENGER, B. F., *Local School Administration,* McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., New York, 1951, chaps. 1, 27.

SEARS, JESSE B., *The Nature of the Administrative Process,* McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., New York, 1950.

SHANE, HAROLD G. (editor), *The American Elementary School,* Harper & Brothers, New York, 1953, chaps. 1, 14, 16.

SHANE, HAROLD G., and YAUCH, WILBUR A., *Creative School Administration,* Henry Holt and Company, New York, 1954, chaps. 1, 2, 10, 17.

TEAD, ORDWAY, *The Art of Administration,* McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., New York, 1951.

TEAD, ORDWAY, *New Adventures in Democracy,* McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1939, chaps. 1, 8, 16.

TEAD, ORDWAY, "The Roots of Teaching Power in the American Culture," *Seventh Yearbook,* The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Oneonta, New York, 1954.

WAHLQUIST, JOHN T., ARNOLD, WILLIAM E., CAMPBELL, ROALD F., RELLER, THEODORE L., and SANDS, LESTER B., *The Administration of Public Education,* The Ronald Press Company, New York, 1952, chaps. 1, 17.

WILLING, M. H., FOWLKES, J. G., KRUG, E. A., GREGG, R. T., and LIDDLE, C. S., *Schools and Our Democratic Society,* Harper & Brothers, New York, 1951, chaps. 1, 4, 5.

INDEX OF NAMES

Adorno, T. W., 51, 156
Allen, Frederick Lewis, 307
Allen, Hollis P., 127
Alwater, Franklin S., 18, 104, 156, 235
Appleby, Paul H., 18, 51, 103, 127, 156, 204, 235, 291
Arendt, Hannah, 103
Arnold, William E., 307

Bakke, E. Wright, 18, 103, 156, 190, 192, 204
Balderston, C. Canby, 84, 103, 172, 178, 241, 254, 255, 263
Barnard, Chester I., 18, 51, 72, 104, 156, 205, 263, 291
Barnard, Henry, 230
Bartky, John A., 307
Benne, Kenneth D., 51, 72, 104, 156, 235, 291
Berelson, Bernard, 205
Berkson, I. B., 307
Berrien, F. K., 51, 156, 205, 263
Bethel, Lawrence L., 18, 104, 156, 235
Bixler, Genevieve K., 121, 127, 307
Bixler, Roy W., 121, 127, 307
Bogardus, Emory S., 51, 156, 205, 263
Brecht, Robert P., 103, 178
Britt, Stewart H., 51, 157, 205
Brown, Alvin, 104, 127, 157, 178, 235
Brownell, Baker, 157, 205

Campbell, Clyde M., 307
Campbell, Roald F., 307
Cartwright, Dorwin, 18, 51, 134, 135, 157
Cattell, Raymond, 29
Childs, John L., 307
Churchill, Winston, 9
Cleeton, Glen, 51, 72, 235
Corey, Stephen M., 258, 262
Counts, George S., 307
Cracroft, Bernard, 5
Crutchfield, Richard, 19, 52, 144, 150, 158
Cubberley, Ellwood P., 297

Dahir, James, 157, 178
Dale, Ernest, 18, 72, 84, 104, 178, 235, 263
Davis, Ralph C., 19, 51, 104, 127, 157, 179, 235, 263
Davis, Richard Currier, 72, 104, 179, 205
de Huszar, George B., 19, 73, 98, 100, 104, 157, 252, 253, 263
Dewey, John, 230
Dimock, Marshall E., 19, 51, 73, 104, 127, 178, 205, 235, 263, 282, 286, 292
Dodd, Paul A., 106, 159
Dubin, Robert, 19, 51, 85, 87, 104, 127, 157, 205, 252, 263

Edwards, Newton, 231
Eldridge, Seba, 157
Elliott, Eugene B., 169, 170, 176, 179

Fayol, Henri, 19, 52, 73, 104, 127, 157, 179, 235, 292
Fish, Lounsbury S., 19, 65, 73, 94, 105, 125, 127
Fowlkes, John Guy, 307
Freeman, Frank N., 246, 249, 264, 292
Frenkel-Brunswick, Else, 51, 156

Gardner, Burleigh B., 19, 52, 104, 127, 144, 148, 157, 197, 205, 221, 235, 292
Gaus, John Merriman, 19, 73, 127, 179, 292
Glover, John D., 52, 157
Golden, Clinton S., 52, 136, 139, 157, 205
Gordon, Robert Aaron, 52, 235, 263
Gouldner, Alvin W., 28, 30, 52, 157
Gregg, Russell T., 307
Gulick, Luther, 11, 19, 41, 42, 52, 104, 127, 157, 222, 235, 297

Halsey, George D., 157
Harrell, Thomas Willard, 127, 158

Hart, Joseph K., 307
Hempel, Edward H., 52, 104, 179, 263
Hertz, David Bendel, 263
Hillman, Arthur, 158, 179, 235, 292
Holden, Paul E., 19, 65, 73, 94, 105, 125, 127
Hoslett, Schuyler Dean, 19, 31, 32, 52, 105, 158
Hovland, Carl I., 200
Hower, Ralph M., 52, 157
Hyneman, Charles S., 105, 128, 236, 264

Janowitz, Morris, 205

Karabasz, Victor S., 103, 178
Killefer, D. H., 264, 292
Kimball, Dexter S., 73, 105, 158, 236, 264
Kimball, Dexter S., Jr., 73, 105, 158, 236, 264
Knickerbocker, Irving, 44, 50
Kluckhohn, Clyde, 158, 205
Krech, David, 19, 52, 144, 150, 158
Krug, Edward A., 308

Leighton, Alexander H., 19, 52, 105, 158
Leiserson, Avery, 66, 68
Lepawsky, Albert, 19, 73, 94, 105, 128, 179, 264
Lester, Richard A., 158, 264
Levinson, Daniel J., 51, 156
Lewin, Kurt, 19, 151, 152, 154, 158, 179, 264
Lewisohn, Sam A., 52
Liddle, C. S., 308
Lilienthal, David, 9, 307
Livingston, Robert T., 19, 26, 52, 66, 73, 105, 117, 128, 136, 158, 179, 188, 205, 213, 236, 264, 287, 292

MacIver, R. M., 52, 120, 128, 158
Mann, Horace, 100, 230, 297
Mannheim, Karl, 158
Marston, Everett, 205
Martindell, Jackson, 264, 292
Marx, Fritz Morstein, 20, 53, 73, 105, 158, 179, 236, 244, 264, 277, 278, 292
Mason, Charles W., 51, 72, 235
Massarik, Fred, 252
Mayo, Elton, 5, 8, 20, 158, 185, 186, 206
McConnell, T. R., 246, 249, 264, 292
McNaughton, Wayne L., 106, 159
Meadows, Paul, 158, 179, 206
Merriam, Charles E., 105
Miller, George A., 206
Miller, Van, 307
Millett, John D., 167
Milward, G. E., 105, 128, 159, 180, 236, 264
Moehlman, Arthur B., 244, 245, 297, 307
Mooney, James D., 35, 53, 82, 83, 105, 118, 128, 212, 216, 218, 226, 229, 236
Moore, David G., 52, 104, 127, 205, 235
Mort, Paul R., 12, 13, 20, 128, 264, 297, 307
Mosier, Earl E., 56, 57, 176, 179
Muntyan, Bozidar, 51, 104, 156, 235

Newcomb, Theodore M., 20, 53, 141, 142, 159, 189, 206
Newman, William H., 20, 53, 105, 128, 180, 212, 236

Pace, C. Robert, 288, 290
Paish, Sir George, 6
Pfiffner, John M., 105, 180, 236, 264, 292
Pittenger, B. F., 307
Prasow, Paul, 106, 159

Reeves, Floyd W., 297
Reller, Theodore L., 308
Richey, Herman G., 230, 231
Riddle, Robert J., 103, 178
Roethlisberger, F. J., 8, 20, 34, 53, 105, 128, 140, 159, 206, 236, 273, 275, 281, 292
Rosenfarb, Joseph, 106, 180
Ruttenberg, Harold J., 136, 139, 157, 205

Salter, Sir Arthur, 6
Sands, Lester B., 308
Sanford, R. Nevitt, 51, 156
Sargent, S. Stansfeld, 20, 53, 159, 206
Scates, Douglas E., 246, 249, 264, 292
Sears, Jesse B., 13, 20, 53, 96, 121, 123, 128, 180, 215, 225, 236, 297, 308

Selekman, Benjamin M., 53
Shane, Harold G., 308
Sherif, Muzafer, 20, 159
Simon, Herbert A., 20, 60, 73, 106, 128, 180, 192, 194, 199, 206, 229, 236, 241, 264, 277, 292
Slotkin, J. S., 20, 159, 206
Smith, George H. E., 18, 104, 156, 235
Smith, Harold D., 73, 180
Smith, Hubert L., 19, 65, 73, 94, 105, 125, 127
Somervell, Hubert, 159, 292
Spalding, Willard B., 307
Stuckman, Harvey A., Jr., 18, 104, 156, 235

Tannenbaum, Robert, 252
Taylor, Gordon R., 53, 159, 206, 264
Tead, Ordway, 20, 37, 39, 53, 73, 106, 154, 159, 222, 223, 236, 297, 308
Thompson, Loring M., 205
Trecker, Harleigh, 53, 159, 180, 265, 270, 273, 292
Troyer, Maurice E., 287, 288, 290
Trundle, George T., Jr., 106

Urwick, L., 12, 20, 33, 34, 53, 62, 73, 88, 89, 91, 106, 180, 227, 236, 265

Villalon, Luis J. A., 53, 159, 206

Wahlquist, John T., 308
Waldo, Dwight, 53, 106, 280, 292
Walker, Robert A., 20, 180
Watkins, Gordon S., 106, 159
White, Leonard, 20, 53, 106, 159, 180, 206, 218, 219, 220, 236
Whitney, Frederick L., 258
Whyte, William Foote, 159
Willing, M. H., 308

Yauch, Wilbur A., 308
Yoder, Dale, 159, 265

Zacher, Frank, 205
Zander, Alvin, 18, 51, 134, 135, 157

INDEX OF SUBJECTS

Ability to lead, 23–24, 31–33, 46–48
Action research, 258, 259, 260, 261
Administration, 1
  and related fields, 1–20
  as an art, 11
  as a science, 11
  as service function, 56
  authoritarian, 1, 4, 21, 37–38, 107
  democratic, 1, 21, 42–43, 107
  leadership in, 21 ff.
  maturity in the field of, 293, 295, 296, 298
  principles of, 11–15
  professionalizing of, 293, 306
  relationships among areas of, 297–298
  study of, 1
  theory in, 293 ff.
Administrator,
  as educator, 293, 306
  as energizer, 40
  as organizer, 79, 100–103
  as social engineer, 2
  dedication of, 304
  duties of, 1–2, 39–42, 60, 63, 66–72
  power of, 107–110
American Association of School Administrators, 246, 306
American Telephone and Telegraph Company, 282
Appraisal, 266 ff., 287, 305
Atomic energy, 9
Authoritarian organization, 81
Authoritarian society, 160
Authority, 17, 31, 34, 37, 43, 74, 227–229, 287
  conditioning factors of, 111–113
  delegation of, 123–125
  derivation of, 114–117, 126
  factor of, 107 ff.
  final, 107–108
  in democracy, 117–118
  limits on, 109–113
  of situation, 121

Authority—(*Continued*)
  power and, 113–120
  pyramid of, 108–109
  structure of, 108–109

Bargaining, leader's use of, 31–32
Board of education, 245
Bureaucracy, 86–87

Clicques, 197–198, 207
Coercion, 207
Collaboration, in society, 7–10
Committees, 133
Communication, 17–18, 140, 181 ff.
  by grapevine, 181, 197, 199
  channels of, 195, 197, 200–202, 223, 303
  development of, 181–182, 303
  failure of, 181, 201
  formal, 181, 187, 197, 222
  function of, 181 ff., 222, 303
  improvement of, 202–204
  informal, 181, 197–199, 303
  in industry, 185–186, 190–196
  in organization, 181, 222–224, 303
  oral, 183
  psychology of, 182, 204
  response in, 188–190, 200
  restraints upon, 194–196, 198
  social significance of, 181, 303
  system, 187 ff., 223, 303
  techniques of, 190, 202
  two-way process of, 188 ff., 193–194, 200, 303
Community of interest, 225
Community-school relations, 200, 269, 290, 304
Consent-democracy, 99
Control, 32, 121–125
  span of, 219
Cooperation, 5, 7–10, 36–37, 140, 162–163, 208
Cooperative Project in Educational Administration, 306

Coordination, 18, 35–36
activities in, 223
definition of, 211
diagnosis in, 223
factors in, 215, 218, 221
function of, 207 ff.
methods of, 209, 211, 233
prescription in, 224
purpose in, 208, 214, 215

Decision-making, 110, 156, 237 ff., 240–241, 249–250, 254–256, 287
Delegation of authority, 123–125
Democracy, ideals of, 256–257
Democratic organization, 80–81, 98–110
Democratic society, 160
Dictatorship, 37–39, 42–43, 45, 49, 80
Drake University, 301

Education, beliefs in, 299–301
Educational Policies Commission, 307
Efficiency,
appraisal of, 208, 275, 278, 280, 282, 284
in government, 277
in organization, 275–286
morale and, 280, 286
planning and, 160–161, 164, 167
principle of, 275–276, 281
Evaluation, 18, 71–72
continuous process of, 74–76, 84–85, 266, 269, 271, 281, 286
criteria in, 270–273
function of, 266 ff.
group, 266, 269, 271–272, 291
human factors in, 266, 269, 271, 273–275, 278–282, 285–286, 288, 290
in education, 267, 269, 273, 275, 278, 287–291, 305
instruments in, 272–273, 275, 282–285, 288
measurement and, 272–275, 282–283, 286, 288
of administration, 266–267, 270, 275, 288, 305
of planning program, 176
of program, 269–270, 272, 275, 286, 288–290, 305
principles of, 271–273, 276, 288, 305
Evaluation—(*Continued*)
process of, 266–269, 272, 275, 282, 286–291, 305
reasons for, 266–271, 287, 289, 291
responsibility for, 266, 269–273, 275, 281–282, 287–291, 305
self, 266, 268, 274
Exception principle, 170–171

Force, leader's use of, 31, 79

Graded school system, 230–231, 297
Group, 81, 117–119, 129 ff., 227–228, 301–302
adaptation to, 151
advantages of, 155–156
atmosphere of, 152–153
decision-making by, 251–253
dynamics of, 133–135
evaluation by, 266, 269, 271–272, 291
formal, 27, 39, 42–44, 50, 132–133, 136, 139–140, 144
functions of, 141
influence of, 144–147
informal, 27, 39, 42–44, 50, 132–133, 136, 139–140, 142–144
interaction of, 18, 35 ff., 129 ff.
leader of, 152–154
loyalty of, 150–154
planning by, 160, 162–163
problem centering of, 97–99
purpose of, 54, 58–61, 68–72
satisfactions found in, 146–148, 150–151, 153
structure of, 21

Hierarchy of purposes, 278–279
Human relations in administration, 25, 31–32, 35

Informal organization, 78, 86–88, 91–93
Insubordination, 109
Integration, 98
Intelligence function in government, 242
International City Managers' Association, 179, 203

Labor unions, 136–138
Leader, appointed, 27, 31–32
as boss, 22, 37–38

Leader—(*Continued*)
authority of, 31–35, 37
domination by, 39
functions of, 39–42
motivation of, 18, 47–48
personality of, 24–25, 28–30, 33
rise of, 43, 45–47
titular, 27
Leadership, 21 ff., 178, 226, 227, 303
as group of characteristics, 25
as social phenomenon, 42
democratic, 27–28, 36
emergence of, 46–47, 50
in purposing, 60, 63, 65–66, 68, 72
methods of, 30–31, 35–36, 79
pragmatic test of, 37
process of, 22, 40–41, 44, 49–50, 77
role of, 26, 39, 40, 43
skills in, 22–24, 32–33, 46–47, 79
studies of, 21, 28–30
traits of, 28–30

Measurement, 272–273, 282, 284–285, 287–288
Morale, 154, 280, 286
Mutual means, leader's use of, 31

National Conference of Professors of Educational Administration, 257, 301, 305, 306

Orders, 195, 201–202, 255, 287
Organization, 58–59, 69, 71, 77 ff., 101
art of, 82–84
bigness in, 36, 85–87
chart of, 94
concepts of, 77–78
continuous process of, 74, 76, 84–85, 87
democratic, 80–81
factor of, 77 ff.
first principle of, 212
formal, 77–79, 86–89, 91–93
group characteristics of, 140–141
informal, 78, 86–88, 91–93
line-and-staff, 74, 108, 126
paper machinery of, 95–97
school, 100, 102, 231
science of, 93
structure of, 84, 87–91
technique of, 82–83

Paternalism, 31
Plan, characteristics of a, 168
Planning, advantages of, 161–162, 165
as preparation, 165, 168
educational, 169, 172, 178
efficiency and, 161, 164, 167
function of, 160 ff., 286
group, 163, 173–178
legislatures and, 166
plan for, 163, 177
process of, 162–163, 165, 168–169
program, 163–164, 167, 169–170, 173, 287
steps in, 163–164, 166, 169–170, 173, 174
Policy, 65–67, 101, 171–172
Policy-making, 241–242, 244
POSDCORB, 41
Power, 37–39, 98, 113–114, 117–118, 120
Principle, exception, 170–171
of efficiency, 276, 282
of evaluation, 271
Problem-solving, 18, 237 ff.
function of, 237 ff.
principles in, 262–263
steps in, 238, 262–263
Process, administrative, 3
of leadership, 22, 40–41, 44, 49–50, 77
of organizing, 74–76, 84–85
of planning, 162–163, 165, 168–169
Public relations, 200, 269, 290, 304
Purpose, 16, 138–141, 161, 166–167, 215, 266–267, 299–303
development of, 54 ff.
educational, 56–59, 68–72
factor of, 54 ff.
hierarchy of, 278–279
intensity of, 61, 68–69
Pyramid of authority, 109

Records, 171
Recreation, 204
Reorganization of schools, 102
Reports, 171
Research, 237, 246–249, 257–259, 262, 272

School board, responsibilities of, 245
School law, 112
School organization, 100–103
Science of organization, 93–94
Self-evaluation, 266, 268, 274

Social engineer, administrator as, 2
Span of control, 218–219
Stasis, 8
Status, 141–151
Status leader, 43–44
Status positions, 194
Structure, administrative, 1
  school, 231
Superior-subordinate relationships, 194–196

Teacher shortage, 102
Theory in administration, 11–12, 15, 293 ff.

Values, pyramid of, 279